

ATTACHMENT 9

Page 1

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3
4

5 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE)
6 (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION)
7 This Document Relates to:)
8 ALL ACTIONS)
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 ORAL ARGUMENT HEARING
16 San Francisco, California
17 Tuesday, January 5, 2016
18
19
20
21
22

Reported by:

SUZANNE F. BOSCHETTI
CSR No. 5111

<p>1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 3 4 _____ 5) 5 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE) 5 (CRT ANTITRUST LITIGATION) 6 _____) No. 3:07-cv-05944-SC 6) MDL No. 1917 7 This Document Relates to:) 7) 8 ALL ACTIONS) 8 _____ 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ORAL ARGUMENT HEARING held before Special 16 Master Martin Quinn, at JAMS, 2 Embarcadero 17 Center, Suite 1500, San Francisco, California, 18 beginning at 9:55 a.m. and ending at 1:17 p.m., 19 on Tuesday, January 5, 2015, before SUZANNE F. 20 BOSCHETTI, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 21 5111. 22 23 24 25 </p>	<p>Page 2</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 3 FINE, KAPLAN AND BLACK, R.P.C. 4 BY: MATTHEW DUNCAN, ESQ. 5 BY: DONALD L. PERELMAN, ESQ. 6 1 South Broad Street, 23rd Floor 7 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107 8 (215) 567-6565 9 mduncan@finekaplan.com 10 dperelman@finekaplan.com 11 12 FREEDMAN BOYD HOLLANDER GOLDBERG URIAS & WARD P.A. 13 BY: JOSEPH GOLDBERG, ESQ. 14 20 First Plaza, Suite 700 15 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102 16 (505) 244-7520 17 jg@fbdlaw.com 18 19 KIRBY McINERNEY LLP 20 BY: ROBERT J. GRALEWSKI, JR., ESQ. 21 600 B Street, Suite 1900 22 San Diego, California 92101 23 (619) 398-4340 24 bgralewski@kmllp.com 25 </p>
<p>1 APPEARANCES: 2 3 JAMS 4 BY: MARTIN QUINN, SPECIAL MASTER 5 2 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1500 6 San Francisco, California 94111 7 (415) 982-5267 8 9 10 For the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs Class: 11 TRUMP ALIOTO TRUMP & PRESCOTT, ATTORNEYS LLP 12 BY: MARIO N. ALIOTO, ESQ. 13 BY: LAUREN C. CAPURRO, ESQ. 14 2280 Union Street 15 San Francisco, California 94123 16 (415) 563-7200 17 marioalioto@atp.com 18 laurenrussell@atp.com 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 </p>	<p>Page 3</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 3 ZELLE HOFMANN VOELBEL & MASON LLP 4 BY: CRAIG C. CORBITT, ESQ. 5 BY: CHRISTOPHER T. MICHELETTI, ESQ. 6 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400 7 San Francisco California 94104 8 (415) 693-0700 9 ccorbitt@zelle.com 10 cmicheletti@zelle.com 11 12 STRAUS & BOIES, LLP 13 BY: NATHAN CIHLAR, ESQ. 14 4041 University Drive, Fifth Floor 15 Fairfax Virginia 22030 16 (703) 764-8700 17 ncihlar@straus-boies.com 18 19 MILBERG LLP 20 BY: PAUL F. NOVAK 21 719 Griswold, Suite 620 22 Detroit, Michigan 48226 23 (313) 309-1761 24 pnovak@milberg.com 25 </p>

2 (Pages 2 - 5)

Veritext Legal Solutions

212-267-6868

www.veritext.com

516-608-2400

<p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 3 KAG LAW GROUP 4 BY: SYLVIE K. KERN, ESQ. 5 2532 Lake Street 6 San Francisco California 94121 7 (415) 221-5763 8 sylviekern@yahoo.com 9 10 ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP 11 BY: JENNIE LEE ANDERSON (By telephone) 12 155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900 13 San Francisco, California 94114 14 (415) 986-1400 15 jennie@andrusanderson.com 16 17 BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER & BIRKHAEUSER 18 BY: DANIEL E. BIRKHAUSER (By telephone) 19 2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 120 20 Walnut Creek, California 94598 21 (925) 945-0200 22 dbirkhaeuser@bramsonplutzik.com 23 24 25</p>	<p>Page 6</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 For Excluded IPPs: 3 BONSIGNORE TRIAL LAWYERS, PLLC 4 BY: ROBERT J. BONSIGNORE, ESQ. 5 3771 Meadowcrest Drive 6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89121 7 (781) 350-0000 8 rbonsignore@classactions.us 9 10 For Objectors Rockhurst University, Harry Garavanian and 11 Gary Talewsky: 12 THERESA D. MOORE, ATTORNEY AT LAW 13 BY: THERESA D. MOORE, ESQ. 14 One Sansome Street, 35th Floor 15 San Francisco, CA 94104 16 (415) 434-8900 17 tmoore@aliotolaw.com 18 19 For Objector Douglas St. John: 20 JOSEPH S. ST. JOHN, ATTORNEY AT LAW 21 BY: JOSEPH S. ST. JOHN, ESQ. 22 514 Mockingbird Lane 23 Long Beach, Mississippi 39560 24 (410) 212-3475 25 j.scott.stjohn.public@gmail.com</p>
<p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 3 For Objecting IPPs: 4 COOPER & KIRKHAM, P.C. 5 BY: JOSEF COOPER, ESQ. 6 BY: TRACY KIRKHAM, ESQ. 7 BY: JOHN D. BOGDANOV, ESQ. 8 357 Tehama Street, 2nd Floor 9 San Francisco, California 94103 10 (415) 788-3030 11 jdc@coopkirk.com 12 trk@coopkirk.com 13 14 LAW OFFICES OF FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA 15 BY: FRANCIS O. SCARPULLA, ESQ. 16 BY: PATRICK CLAYTON, ESQ. 17 456 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor 18 San Francisco California 94104 19 (415) 788-7210 20 fos@scarpullalaw.com 21 22 23 24 25</p>	<p>Page 7</p> <p>1 APPEARANCES (Continued): 2 3 For Objectors John Finn and Laura Fortman: 4 THE KRESS LAW FIRM LLC 5 BY: JOHN KRESS, ESQ. (By telephone) 6 4247 South Grand Boulevard 7 St. Louis, Missouri 63111 8 (314) 631-3883 9 jckress@thekresslawfirm.com 10 11 STEVE A. MILLER, ATTORNEY AT LAW (By telephone) 12 1625 Larimer St., No. 2905 13 Denver, CO 80202-1539 14 sampco1@gmail.com 15 16 For Objector Sean Hull: 17 BANDAS LAW FIRM, P.C. 18 BY: CHRISTOPHER A. BANDAS, ESQ. (By telephone) 19 500 N. Shoreline Boulevard, Suite 1020 20 Corpus Christi, Texas 78401 21 (361) 698-5200 22 cbandas@bandaslawfirm.com 23 24 25</p>

3 (Pages 6 - 9)

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 10px;"></td><td style="text-align: right;">Page 10</td></tr> <tr><td>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2 For Hitachi Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4 BY: ELIOT A. ADELSON, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5 555 California Street</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6 San Francisco California 94104</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7 (415) 439-1313</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8 eadelson@kirkland.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10 For Samsung SDI Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>12 BY: MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>13 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>14 San Francisco California 94111-4109</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>15 (415) 434-9100</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>16 mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>18 For Philips Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>19 BAKER BOTTS LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>20 BY: ERIK T. KOONS, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>21 BY: JOHN TALADAY, ESQ. (By telephone)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>22 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>23 Washington, D.C. 40004-2400</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>24 erik.koons@bakerbotts.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>25 john.taladay@bakerbotts.com</td><td></td></tr> </table>		Page 10	1 APPEARANCES (Continued):		2 For Hitachi Defendants:		3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP		4 BY: ELIOT A. ADELSON, ESQ.		5 555 California Street		6 San Francisco California 94104		7 (415) 439-1313		8 eadelson@kirkland.com		9		10 For Samsung SDI Defendants:		11 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP		12 BY: MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ.		13 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor		14 San Francisco California 94111-4109		15 (415) 434-9100		16 mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com		17		18 For Philips Defendants:		19 BAKER BOTTS LLP		20 BY: ERIK T. KOONS, ESQ.		21 BY: JOHN TALADAY, ESQ. (By telephone)		22 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW		23 Washington, D.C. 40004-2400		24 erik.koons@bakerbotts.com		25 john.taladay@bakerbotts.com		<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 10px;"></td><td style="text-align: right;">Page 12</td></tr> <tr><td>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3 For Chunghwa Picture Tube Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4 GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5 BY: RACHEL S. BRASS, ESQ. (By telephone)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6 555 Mission Street</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7 San Francisco, California 94105-0921</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8 (415) 393-8293</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9 rbrass@gibsondunn.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11 For the State of California:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>12 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>13 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>14 BY: EMILIO VARANINI, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>15 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>16 San Francisco California 94102-7002</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>17 (415) 703-5908</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>18 emilio.varanini@doj.ca.gov</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>22</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>24</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td></td></tr> </table>		Page 12	1 APPEARANCES (Continued):		2		3 For Chunghwa Picture Tube Defendants:		4 GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP		5 BY: RACHEL S. BRASS, ESQ. (By telephone)		6 555 Mission Street		7 San Francisco, California 94105-0921		8 (415) 393-8293		9 rbrass@gibsondunn.com		10		11 For the State of California:		12 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE		13 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL		14 BY: EMILIO VARANINI, ESQ.		15 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000		16 San Francisco California 94102-7002		17 (415) 703-5908		18 emilio.varanini@doj.ca.gov		19		20		21		22		23		24		25	
	Page 10																																																																																																								
1 APPEARANCES (Continued):																																																																																																									
2 For Hitachi Defendants:																																																																																																									
3 KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP																																																																																																									
4 BY: ELIOT A. ADELSON, ESQ.																																																																																																									
5 555 California Street																																																																																																									
6 San Francisco California 94104																																																																																																									
7 (415) 439-1313																																																																																																									
8 eadelson@kirkland.com																																																																																																									
9																																																																																																									
10 For Samsung SDI Defendants:																																																																																																									
11 SHEPPARD MULLIN RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP																																																																																																									
12 BY: MICHAEL W. SCARBOROUGH, ESQ.																																																																																																									
13 Four Embarcadero Center, 17th Floor																																																																																																									
14 San Francisco California 94111-4109																																																																																																									
15 (415) 434-9100																																																																																																									
16 mscarborough@sheppardmullin.com																																																																																																									
17																																																																																																									
18 For Philips Defendants:																																																																																																									
19 BAKER BOTTS LLP																																																																																																									
20 BY: ERIK T. KOONS, ESQ.																																																																																																									
21 BY: JOHN TALADAY, ESQ. (By telephone)																																																																																																									
22 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW																																																																																																									
23 Washington, D.C. 40004-2400																																																																																																									
24 erik.koons@bakerbotts.com																																																																																																									
25 john.taladay@bakerbotts.com																																																																																																									
	Page 12																																																																																																								
1 APPEARANCES (Continued):																																																																																																									
2																																																																																																									
3 For Chunghwa Picture Tube Defendants:																																																																																																									
4 GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP																																																																																																									
5 BY: RACHEL S. BRASS, ESQ. (By telephone)																																																																																																									
6 555 Mission Street																																																																																																									
7 San Francisco, California 94105-0921																																																																																																									
8 (415) 393-8293																																																																																																									
9 rbrass@gibsondunn.com																																																																																																									
10																																																																																																									
11 For the State of California:																																																																																																									
12 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE																																																																																																									
13 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL																																																																																																									
14 BY: EMILIO VARANINI, ESQ.																																																																																																									
15 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000																																																																																																									
16 San Francisco California 94102-7002																																																																																																									
17 (415) 703-5908																																																																																																									
18 emilio.varanini@doj.ca.gov																																																																																																									
19																																																																																																									
20																																																																																																									
21																																																																																																									
22																																																																																																									
23																																																																																																									
24																																																																																																									
25																																																																																																									
<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 10px;"></td><td style="text-align: right;">Page 11</td></tr> <tr><td>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2 For Panasonic Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4 BY: MARTIN C. GEAGAN, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5 200 Park Avenue</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6 New York, New York 10166</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7 (212) 294-4615</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8 mgeagan@winston.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10 For Thomson Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11 FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>12 BY: KATHY L. OSBORN, ESQ. (By telephone)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>13 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>14 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>15 (317) 237-8562</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>16 kathy.osborn@faegrebd.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>18 For Toshiba Defendants:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>19 WHITE & CASE LLP</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>20 BY: CHRISTOPHER M. CURRAN, ESQ. (By telephone)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>21 BY: J. MARK GIDLEY, ESQ. (By telephone)</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>22 701 Thirteenth Street, NW</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>23 Washington D.C. 20005-3807</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>24 (202) 626-3609</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>25 ccurran@whitecase.com</td><td></td></tr> </table>		Page 11	1 APPEARANCES (Continued):		2 For Panasonic Defendants:		3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP		4 BY: MARTIN C. GEAGAN, ESQ.		5 200 Park Avenue		6 New York, New York 10166		7 (212) 294-4615		8 mgeagan@winston.com		9		10 For Thomson Defendants:		11 FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP		12 BY: KATHY L. OSBORN, ESQ. (By telephone)		13 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700		14 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204		15 (317) 237-8562		16 kathy.osborn@faegrebd.com		17		18 For Toshiba Defendants:		19 WHITE & CASE LLP		20 BY: CHRISTOPHER M. CURRAN, ESQ. (By telephone)		21 BY: J. MARK GIDLEY, ESQ. (By telephone)		22 701 Thirteenth Street, NW		23 Washington D.C. 20005-3807		24 (202) 626-3609		25 ccurran@whitecase.com		<table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr><td style="width: 10px;"></td><td style="text-align: right;">Page 13</td></tr> <tr><td>1 APPEARANCES (Continued):</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>2</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>3 For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Class:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>4 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>5 BY: GUIDO SAVERI, ESQ.</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>6 706 Sansome Street</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>7 San Francisco, California 94111</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>8 (415) 217-6810</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>9 guido@saveri.com</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>11 Also Present:</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>12 MARLA COHEN, ESQ.: Research Attorney</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>13</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>14</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>15</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>16</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>17</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>18</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>19</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>20</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>21</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>22</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>23</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>24</td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>25</td><td></td></tr> </table>		Page 13	1 APPEARANCES (Continued):		2		3 For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Class:		4 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.		5 BY: GUIDO SAVERI, ESQ.		6 706 Sansome Street		7 San Francisco, California 94111		8 (415) 217-6810		9 guido@saveri.com		10		11 Also Present:		12 MARLA COHEN, ESQ.: Research Attorney		13		14		15		16		17		18		19		20		21		22		23		24		25	
	Page 11																																																																																																								
1 APPEARANCES (Continued):																																																																																																									
2 For Panasonic Defendants:																																																																																																									
3 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP																																																																																																									
4 BY: MARTIN C. GEAGAN, ESQ.																																																																																																									
5 200 Park Avenue																																																																																																									
6 New York, New York 10166																																																																																																									
7 (212) 294-4615																																																																																																									
8 mgeagan@winston.com																																																																																																									
9																																																																																																									
10 For Thomson Defendants:																																																																																																									
11 FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP																																																																																																									
12 BY: KATHY L. OSBORN, ESQ. (By telephone)																																																																																																									
13 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700																																																																																																									
14 Indianapolis, Indiana 46204																																																																																																									
15 (317) 237-8562																																																																																																									
16 kathy.osborn@faegrebd.com																																																																																																									
17																																																																																																									
18 For Toshiba Defendants:																																																																																																									
19 WHITE & CASE LLP																																																																																																									
20 BY: CHRISTOPHER M. CURRAN, ESQ. (By telephone)																																																																																																									
21 BY: J. MARK GIDLEY, ESQ. (By telephone)																																																																																																									
22 701 Thirteenth Street, NW																																																																																																									
23 Washington D.C. 20005-3807																																																																																																									
24 (202) 626-3609																																																																																																									
25 ccurran@whitecase.com																																																																																																									
	Page 13																																																																																																								
1 APPEARANCES (Continued):																																																																																																									
2																																																																																																									
3 For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Class:																																																																																																									
4 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.																																																																																																									
5 BY: GUIDO SAVERI, ESQ.																																																																																																									
6 706 Sansome Street																																																																																																									
7 San Francisco, California 94111																																																																																																									
8 (415) 217-6810																																																																																																									
9 guido@saveri.com																																																																																																									
10																																																																																																									
11 Also Present:																																																																																																									
12 MARLA COHEN, ESQ.: Research Attorney																																																																																																									
13																																																																																																									
14																																																																																																									
15																																																																																																									
16																																																																																																									
17																																																																																																									
18																																																																																																									
19																																																																																																									
20																																																																																																									
21																																																																																																									
22																																																																																																									
23																																																																																																									
24																																																																																																									
25																																																																																																									

4 (Pages 10 - 13)

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 14</p> <p>1 San Francisco, California; Tuesday, January 5, 2016 2 10:09 a.m. 3 ---oo0--- 4 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Good morning. I'd like you to 6 identify yourselves for my benefit if not the court 7 reporter's. That would be good. 8 MR. ALIOTO: Good morning. Mario Alioto, lead 9 counsel for the indirect purchasers. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. And everyone has to 11 speak up, you know, without yelling at each other. But 12 we have to almost yell at each other because we not only 13 have to be sure Ms. Cohen and I hear, but the people on 14 the phone have to hear. 15 MS. CAPURRO: Good morning, Your Honor. Lauren 16 Capurro for the indirect purchaser plaintiffs. 17 MR. DUNCAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Matthew 18 Duncan from Fine, Kaplan and Black in Philadelphia for 19 the IPPs. 20 MR. GOLDBERG: Good morning, Mr. Quinn. My 21 name is Joe Goldberg from Freedman Boyd Hollander 22 Goldberg Urias & Ward in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for 23 the IPPs. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: I was just there. 25 MR. GOLDBERG: So was I.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 16</p> <p>1 MS. MOORE: Theresa Moore for objectors 2 Rockhurst University, Garavanian and Talewsky. 3 MR. VARANINI: Emilio Varanini on behalf of the 4 California Attorney General's Office. 5 MR. SAVERI: Guido Saveri. I'm the lead 6 counsel for the direct purchasers. I do not intend to 7 participate. I'm here just as an observer, but I see a 8 lot of my friends here that I haven't seen for years. 9 Mr. Goldberg and the whole crowd, it's nice to see you. 10 Nice to see you again. You have your problems. The 11 direct purchase plaintiffs, as you know, are all 12 finished, and we're here to see what's going on. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. 14 MR. SAVERI: Nice to see you. I'd like to see 15 several of you later and renew old acquaintances. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: We appreciate the support. 17 MS. KERN: Sylvie Kern for the indirect 18 purchaser plaintiffs. 19 MR. GRALEWSKI: Bob Gralewski, Kirby McInerney, 20 on behalf of the indirect purchaser plaintiffs. 21 MR. MICHELETTI: Chris Micheletti with Zelle on 22 behalf of the IPPs. 23 MR. PERELMAN: Don Perelman, Fine, Kaplan and 24 Black, for the IPPs. 25 MR. BOGDANOV: John Bogdanov with Cooper &</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15</p> <p>1 MS. KIRKHAM: Good morning. Tracy Kirkham of 2 Cooper & Kirkham on behalf of the objecting indirect 3 purchaser plaintiffs. 4 MR. COOPER: Josef Cooper, the second half of 5 the firm. 6 MR. SCARPULLA: Francis Scarpulla, Your Honor, 7 from the Law Offices of Francis Scarpulla in 8 San Francisco for the same objectors. 9 MR. BONSIGNORE: Robert Bonsignore on behalf of 10 the excluded plaintiffs. Excuse me for yelling. 11 MR. ADELSON: Eliot Adelson of Kirkland & Ellis 12 for Hitachi. 13 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Michael Scarborough of 14 Shepard Mullin for the Samsung SDI defendants. 15 MR. KOONS: Erik Koons, Baker Botts, on behalf 16 of Philips defendants. 17 MR. GEAGAN: Martin Geagan, Winston & Strawn, 18 on behalf of the Panasonic defendants. 19 MR. CORBITT: Good morning, Your Honor. Craig 20 Corbitt for the IPPs. 21 MR. CIHLAR: Nathan Cihlar from Straus & Boies 22 for the IPPs. 23 MR. NOVAK: Paul Novak of Milberg for the IPPs. 24 MR. ST. JOHN: Joseph St. John for objector 25 Douglas St. John.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 17</p> <p>1 Kirkham, objecting IPPs. 2 MR. CLAYTON: And Patrick Clayton from the Law 3 Offices of Francis O. Scarpulla for the objecting IPPs. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. And on the phone, 5 if you could announce yourselves. 6 MR. BANDAS: Chris Bandas for objector Sean 7 Hull. 8 MS. OSBORN: This is Kathy Osborn for 9 defendants, the Thomson defendants. 10 MS. BRASS: This is Rachel Brass for the 11 Chunghwa Picture Tube defendants. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. 13 MR. HOAG: You have Frank Hogue and Chris 14 Curran from White & Case on behalf of the Toshiba 15 defendants. 16 MR. TALADAY: John Taladay from Baker Botts on 17 behalf of the Philips defendants. 18 MR. KRESS: John Kress on behalf of John Finn 19 and Laura Fortman. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Kress, who are you 21 representing? 22 MR. KRESS: John Finn and Laura Fortman. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. 24 MR. BIRKHAEUSER: One more, Your Honor. Dan 25 Birkhauser of Bramson, Plutzik, Mahler & Birkhaeuser on</p>

<p>1 behalf of the IPPs.</p> <p>2 MS. ANDERSON: And Jennie Lee Anderson of</p> <p>3 Andrus Anderson on behalf of IPPs.</p> <p>4 MR. MILLER: And Steve Miller, co-counsel with</p> <p>5 John Kress on behalf of Finn and Fortman.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Anyone else on the</p> <p>7 phone who has not announced himself or herself?</p> <p>8 All right. Here comes the email address from</p> <p>9 the court reporter.</p> <p>10 (Reporter complies.)</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Did everyone get that?</p> <p>12 All right. So there is no perfect way to run a</p> <p>13 hearing like this. I think what I'd like to do is go</p> <p>14 issue by issue and take up, you know, the various issues</p> <p>15 that are on my mind, and then at the end give you an</p> <p>16 opportunity to raise any issues that we haven't covered.</p> <p>17 And in no particular order, I've just jotted down five</p> <p>18 issues that I'd like to cover.</p> <p>19 First, the first is an issue that nobody raised</p> <p>20 except me, which is it premature for the special</p> <p>21 master to be issuing a report and recommendation on the</p> <p>22 appropriateness of the settlement when there's a motion</p> <p>23 pending to appoint co-lead counsel that would</p> <p>24 potentially impact that -- that -- you know, the</p> <p>25 fairness and reasonableness of the settlement.</p>	<p>Page 18</p> <p>1 that's just words of caution.</p> <p>2 So I guess I'd like to ask Mr. Cooper and/or</p> <p>3 Mr. Scarpulla, is it premature for me to submit a report</p> <p>4 and recommendation on these issues on the 15th when you</p> <p>5 are going to have a hearing, I believe on January 17, on</p> <p>6 your motion to be appointed co-lead counsel to represent</p> <p>7 the interests of class members in -- in non-repeater</p> <p>8 states?</p> <p>9 MR. COOPER: I guess we have debated that issue</p> <p>10 back and forth, Your Honor, as to what to do before we</p> <p>11 filed. We debated that question before we filed a</p> <p>12 motion. And we know the schedule is the one that is</p> <p>13 set, and we have not asked the court to change the</p> <p>14 schedule or asked you to change the schedule. We do not</p> <p>15 have any intention, if appointed co-lead counsel, of</p> <p>16 doing anything other than proceeding with the objections</p> <p>17 which have been advanced.</p> <p>18 So we would be proceeding with those objections</p> <p>19 with or without the designation. The defendants raised</p> <p>20 the question in response to the motion to be appointed</p> <p>21 as to whether we would be withdrawing from the</p> <p>22 settlements. And we said, you know, finally we filed</p> <p>23 that we can't withdraw from a contract that Mr. Alioto</p> <p>24 entered into.</p> <p>25 We can object, and we can be the court</p>
<p>Page 19</p> <p>1 Second, the issue of the appropriateness of</p> <p>2 releasing the class members in non-repeater states and</p> <p>3 releasing the class members in the three repealer states</p> <p>4 that were omitted from the litigation class.</p> <p>5 Third, the issue of the adequacy of the notice.</p> <p>6 Fourth, issues that have been raised by</p> <p>7 objectors relating to the Chunghwa settlement.</p> <p>8 And fifth, the issue raised by the Attorney</p> <p>9 General of -- as to whether the claim deadline should be</p> <p>10 extended and other issues that the Attorney General has</p> <p>11 raised in her statement of interest.</p> <p>12 So those are the top items on my hit list, and</p> <p>13 then we can certainly discuss anything after that. For</p> <p>14 those who haven't appeared before me, I mean, just</p> <p>15 realize that Ms. Cohen and I have read all the briefs.</p> <p>16 I get sort of restive when people repeat what's in their</p> <p>17 briefs, particularly if they do so at great length. So</p> <p>18 please, you know, try to keep your -- your comments</p> <p>19 succinct.</p> <p>20 There are a lot of people who probably want to</p> <p>21 talk today, and I want to have the chance to give</p> <p>22 everybody a full and fair hearing. On the other hand,</p> <p>23 we have a lot to do to get this report and</p> <p>24 recommendation in shape, and I don't want to spend an</p> <p>25 unreasonable amount of time in an oral hearing. So</p>	<p>Page 21</p> <p>1 designated people to actually advance and advocate for</p> <p>2 this group, this large group of people, the non-repeater</p> <p>3 states that have not had anyone advocating for them</p> <p>4 where their rights and the interests have been</p> <p>5 abandoned. We think that the objections would be the</p> <p>6 same. So I don't think it would make any difference</p> <p>7 whether you delayed or didn't delay. You would be</p> <p>8 facing the same questions and issues.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I mean, hypothetically</p> <p>10 -- and I appreciate this isn't an issue for me, it's for</p> <p>11 Judge Tigar, but hypothetically, if you were appointed</p> <p>12 in some capacity, co-lead counsel or allocation counsel</p> <p>13 or something, you know, would you want to do due</p> <p>14 diligence? Would you want to do discovery? Would you</p> <p>15 want to say to the court we object to the special</p> <p>16 master's report and recommendation that just came out</p> <p>17 two days ago and we essentially want a do-over?</p> <p>18 MR. COOPER: Well, we have -- we have a</p> <p>19 schedule for objecting if necessary or we decide to, you</p> <p>20 know, report recommendations. The objections that we've</p> <p>21 logged are the same. It's showing that as has been made</p> <p>22 by Mr. Alioto with regard to the propriety and adequacy</p> <p>23 of the settlement is presumably the same.</p> <p>24 We've asked for discovery with regard to the</p> <p>25 fee matters, and I realize we're not doing that. I</p>

6 (Pages 18 - 21)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 believe some people have asked for discovery. But 2 there's been a showing, such as it is, with regard to 3 the adequacy of the settlement and why nothing is being 4 recovered in any way, shape or form for the non-repealer 5 state people. Those arguments are the same whether we 6 have the designation of co-lead counsel or not.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So I take it your 8 answer is, to my question is no. It's not premature. I 9 should go ahead and issue the report and the 10 recommendation on the -- on the same schedule?</p> <p>11 MR. COOPER: I guess that's the answer, yes. 12 Yes, it might be premature for other reasons. For 13 example, we've suggested with regard to the notice that 14 you ought to have an independent expert who can 15 actually, from an expert's perspective, evaluate the 16 notice issues that, to my knowledge, we've not acted on 17 that in any way. So that might be one reason why you 18 would -- it would be appropriate to do it.</p> <p>19 But I guess what I'm trying to say is the 20 objections are the objections. If you feel that there's 21 a reason why designation as co-lead counsel -- and the 22 co-lead was to be Mr. Scarpulla and myself for this 23 group of people. It wasn't that we would be co-lead 24 with Mr. Alioto for the entire --</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: I understand.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 about it. We need to address the issues right now. 2 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Thank you. At the 3 end of the table?</p> <p>4 MR. BONSIGNORE: Can you hear me? 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Bonsignore, yes. 6 MR. BONSIGNORE: Okay. I didn't want to yell 7 again. My name is Robert Bonsignore, and I also put in 8 a request to be appointed co-lead. I would say that it 9 is premature because once the co-leads are appointed, 10 they have an interest to streamline the issues and also 11 to revisit what's been filed. Also a lot of things 12 weren't done. I personally think that it's premature, 13 especially given the authority that Judge Tigar is 14 likely, given the typical powers of appointment, the 15 powers that Judge Tigar is likely to give the co-leads 16 for these excluded plaintiffs.</p> <p>17 So I take the opposite position of Mr. Cooper. 18 In framing the issue, you listed everything that I would 19 have put out there, and so I'm not going to bother 20 repeating myself -- yourself, rather.</p> <p>21 SPECIAL MASTER: And just remind me. When did 22 you make this request to be appointed co-lead counsel? 23 MR. BONSIGNORE: Just -- I'll pull it up. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: So it was -- it was in -- 25 MR. COOPER: It was in a reply brief.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 MR. COOPER: Yeah. 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Scarpulla? 3 MR. SCARPULLA: Yes, Your Honor, just to follow 4 up on that. It probably makes a difference what Judge 5 Tigar does in terms of the responsibilities of any 6 co-leads if he decides to appoint them. So it might be 7 a good idea to ask him what -- what he wants. 8 MR. COOPER: I think it's clear from our answer 9 to your question, Your Honor, that there's some 10 ambivalence about that question which, as I said when we 11 started, we debated about as to whether that would or 12 would not be the appropriate way. And we came down on 13 the side of not asking the schedule be changed. 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 15 MR. COOPER: But we're acknowledging, I guess, 16 the legitimacy of your inquiry. 17 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Thank you. 18 Mr. Alioto? 19 MR. ALIOTO: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. 20 There's no ambivalence on our side. This matter is 21 squarely before Your Honor. There's a court order 22 scheduled in place. There's been no request for relief 23 to delay things. A lot of this matter is going to have 24 to be reviewed again by Judge Tigar de novo. The matter 25 is ripe. The matter is tee'd up. No ambivalence at all</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 MS. KIRKHAM: It was on the schedule for the 2 opposition/response, that it was a joinder and request 3 -- a joinder in our motion and request to be added as 4 another lead counsel. 5 MR. BONSIGNORE: It was either December 24th or 6 25th because I remember the preparation was less 7 than popular in my office. 8 MR. COOPER: It was December 28th. It was 9 December 28th, the due date for the oppositions. 10 MS. MOORE: Your Honor? 11 SPECIAL MASTER: Ms. Moore. 12 MS. MOORE: First of all, I think the court has 13 changed the date of the hearing on the motion for 14 co-lead counsel to the 21st. So there's a little bit 15 more time. And I think that the court would be -- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: There's more time for the 17 judge. There's not more time for me. 18 MS. MOORE: No more time for you. 19 It seems to me the judge would be interested in 20 hearing or seeing your report, and I think that that 21 would inform him on the motion. 22 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Anyone else have 23 any thoughts on this before we get down -- 24 MR. BONSIGNORE: I object to her logic. I 25 think it's self-serving and makes no sense to me.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Noted.</p> <p>2 All right. All right. Let's move on then.</p> <p>3 Thank you for that. Let's move on then to the issue of</p> <p>4 the appropriateness of -- well, let me first ask a</p> <p>5 preliminary question.</p> <p>6 Mr. Alioto seemed to suggest in I think his</p> <p>7 most recent filing that it might be possible to separate</p> <p>8 the approval of the settlement amount with the</p> <p>9 defendants, that is, the approval of the total amount of</p> <p>10 the settlement as being fair, adequate and reasonable</p> <p>11 and somehow separate or defer -- I wasn't quite sure</p> <p>12 what was being suggested -- the issue of the fairness,</p> <p>13 reasonableness and adequacy of the allocation plan.</p> <p>14 Mr. Alioto, just before we get to the merits of</p> <p>15 that issue, what did you have in mind there?</p> <p>16 MR. ALIOTO: Well, what I had in mind was this,</p> <p>17 Your Honor. The starting point for these settlements is</p> <p>18 the settlement agreements themselves. That sets out all</p> <p>19 of the essential terms of the settlements. That's what</p> <p>20 we referred to as the settlement.</p> <p>21 The plan of allocation is something that we,</p> <p>22 the indirect purchaser lawyers, have put together. It's</p> <p>23 something that in our best judgment will effectuate the</p> <p>24 settlements. This is not all spelled out. This plan of</p> <p>25 allocations, the releases, the notice provisions, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 in your mind if -- if I were to say all right, the</p> <p>2 settlement vis-à-vis the defendants is fair, adequate</p> <p>3 and reasonable. \$576 million, given all the factors</p> <p>4 that you're supposed to consider, is an appropriate</p> <p>5 settlement, but the plan of allocation proposed is</p> <p>6 faulty in these ways. That would have the result of not</p> <p>7 sending you back to the negotiation table with the</p> <p>8 defendants, but it would require you to do some in-house</p> <p>9 tinkering perhaps with the allocation plan.</p> <p>10 And I -- by suggesting it, I do not mean to</p> <p>11 suggest I am headed in that direction. I just throw</p> <p>12 that out -- I just want to know if -- would that create</p> <p>13 any procedural or legal problems if I were to proceed</p> <p>14 that way?</p> <p>15 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. No, that would be welcome.</p> <p>16 One part of that would not be welcome was -- would be if</p> <p>17 you were to come to the conclusion that our proposal was</p> <p>18 not reasonable and not adequate, that -- that would</p> <p>19 cause some concern.</p> <p>20 But to the extent you felt that there were</p> <p>21 other reasonable ways to approach this or other ways to</p> <p>22 get this settlement approved and accommodate the</p> <p>23 interests of objectors and the attorney general, we</p> <p>24 would be open to that, and we would welcome this kind of</p> <p>25 piecemeal approach, the underlying settlement approved,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 various -- the various terms attendant to the underlying</p> <p>2 settlements, they're not set out anywhere. This is a</p> <p>3 plan devised by indirect purchaser counsel in</p> <p>4 consultation with experts and notice experts.</p> <p>5 And what I meant to suggest there is that this</p> <p>6 plan of allocation is reasonable. This plan is</p> <p>7 sustainable. This plan ought to be implemented. \$576</p> <p>8 million ought to be distributed to the claimants, but</p> <p>9 our broader goal is to get something done. And to the</p> <p>10 extent Your Honor feels that yes, it's reasonable, but</p> <p>11 I'd like to adopt plan B, which is also reasonable, or</p> <p>12 plan C, which is also reasonable -- I have no pride of</p> <p>13 authorship here. I'm not dug in. My goal is to get</p> <p>14 this settlement approved.</p> <p>15 That's what the thought is there when we cited</p> <p>16 that law to you that says there's the underlying</p> <p>17 settlements and there's the plan. There may be</p> <p>18 different ways to get this done to get everybody happy.</p> <p>19 I don't -- I certainly am not advocating for these other</p> <p>20 ways, but if those other ways meet due process and</p> <p>21 they're fair and reasonable and we can accommodate</p> <p>22 somebody's concerns, we're more than willing to do that</p> <p>23 to get this done.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: So hypothetically, and I</p> <p>25 really mean hypothetically, would it create any problems</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 then get on to the approval of the allocation. And I'm</p> <p>2 not saying that has to be months apart. But --</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, the settlement</p> <p>4 officially as proposed under this hypothetical would not</p> <p>5 be approved. The terms of the settlement vis-à-vis the</p> <p>6 defendants would be approved, but you would have to go</p> <p>7 back and propose another plan of allocation to fix</p> <p>8 whatever defects I found.</p> <p>9 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. And again, I don't know that</p> <p>10 you have to determine that they are defects. I think</p> <p>11 you could -- you could identify matters that could be</p> <p>12 addressed and solved in different ways. And I'm sure we</p> <p>13 could put our heads together and come up with something</p> <p>14 that's very close to what we proposed and that would</p> <p>15 moot concerns.</p> <p>16 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>17 MR. ALIOTO: I mean --</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: So I don't -- anyone else have</p> <p>19 any thoughts about this? What about the defendants? If</p> <p>20 I were to proceed that way, would that cause any</p> <p>21 heartburn for the defendants?</p> <p>22 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Your Honor, Mike Scarborough</p> <p>23 for the Samsung SDI defendants, and I'll attempt to</p> <p>24 articulate a general defense consensus.</p> <p>25 I think what Your Honor outlined would be</p>

8 (Pages 26 - 29)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 30</p> <p>1 constructive, and I think it would be welcome for our 2 side. Our primary interest is in getting the 3 agreements, the contracts that we entered into approved 4 in terms of the amount of money being paid collectively 5 and the releases that we bargained for being approved as 6 fair, adequate and reasonable.</p> <p>7 And we do believe that the allocation issues 8 logically can come later, later down the line. And so 9 we would like to get at least past that first hurdle of 10 the underlying agreements vis-à-vis the defendants are 11 fair, adequate and reasonable and deserving of a final 12 approval.</p> <p>13 And we do view many of the objections as really 14 going to allocation issues, and as a general matter we 15 don't have a problem with some tinkering being done to 16 the plan of allocation proposed by lead counsel.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Scarpulla.</p> <p>18 MR. SCARPULLA: Yes, Your Honor. On that -- 19 first of all, I think I heard Mr. Scarborough say 20 something about the releases. That's a different issue 21 than the amount of money because the releases, of 22 course, release claims by half the country for zero 23 consideration.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: No, but -- I'm sorry to 25 interrupt. But I mean hypothetically, you could say the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 32</p> <p>1 MR. COOPER: Can I supplement? Maybe I'm 2 saying the same thing in a different way. In order to 3 --</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: Try not to.</p> <p>5 MR. COOPER: In order to rule on the adequacy 6 of a settlement, you have to know what claims you're 7 settling. Here we know that the claims of over half the 8 country were valued at zero. And it seems very clear 9 from everything that's gone on, the amount of money that 10 was paid was paid for those claims which Mr. Alioto felt 11 had merit. Nothing was paid for those claims which had 12 no merit in Mr. Alioto's view.</p> <p>13 So if you're now going to pay money to those 14 people, you've got to take it away under that procedure 15 from the claimants whose claims were being settled for a 16 fixed amount of money, which reduces it by \$1 or more, 17 reduces the amount available.</p> <p>18 There's been however many notices that have 19 gone out that have told people if you're not in those 21 20 jurisdictions, you're not going to get paid. You'd have 21 to be renouncing, seeing what objections there would be.</p> <p>22 Now it might be possible to say that amount of 23 money takes care of the claims in 22 jurisdictions and 24 get rid of the national class and leave those 25 non-repeater people on to their own devices, to have a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 31</p> <p>1 releases are appropriate, but there's got to be some 2 compensation paid to those people --</p> <p>3 MR. SCARPULLA: Correct.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: -- which is not an issue, I 5 take it, that would bother the defendants. They don't 6 care how the money -- to whom the money is paid, they 7 just want their releases.</p> <p>8 MR. SCARPULLA: Yes, Your Honor, that is 9 correct, and I was getting to that point, which would 10 mean that the amount of money is therefore not 11 sufficient because you'd be spreading it out -- if they 12 settle for half the country, not the whole country, then 13 you'd be spreading it out over the whole country. You'd 14 have to give new notice to everybody. I mean, there are 15 all those issues.</p> <p>16 And remember, as Your Honor may recall in LCDs, 17 we settled that case, including for the states, 18 \$1.1 billion. The conspiracy here was of longer 19 duration. There were hundreds of meetings throughout 20 the world. Hundreds more than in LCDs. The affected 21 commerce was much larger, and the settlement was half 22 that amount and excluded three repealer states. So if 23 you include them in, you'll have to get more money from 24 somewhere, Your Honor, to --</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Got it.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 33</p> <p>1 different counsel represent them, attempt to get class 2 certification or whatever went on; to litigate the 3 issues of whether they have claims, or, as Mr. Alioto 4 says, they have no claim.</p> <p>5 But to try to separate them here without 6 knowing how much money that's going to go to those 7 people, whether that now leaves an adequate amount for 8 the non-repeater states and for the repealer states -- 9 you know, are they going to get one dollar, are they 10 going to get 50 percent of the money. You'd need to 11 know all of those issues to be able to evaluate the 12 adequacy of the settlement. So what claims are being 13 settled is the first question.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I don't want to spend 15 any more time on this. Anyone have something new that 16 hasn't been said before?</p> <p>17 Ms. Moore.</p> <p>18 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, in order to approve the 19 settlement, there's certain foundational evidence that 20 needs to be in the record, and one of the things that 21 needs to be is that everything is valued, and not all 22 the claims are valued.</p> <p>23 There was nothing in the record that any of 24 these other claims were valued, any of these states that 25 were left out or any of these non-repeater or repealer</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 34</p> <p>1 states that were left out. There was no evidence that 2 they were considered and valued. Not until later on in 3 the reply after it was attacked did they say oh, there 4 was no value.</p> <p>5 So essentially they didn't consider them at 6 all, which makes the \$576 million completely 7 inappropriate. And so you can't approve the settlement 8 at that amount when all of these people being released 9 were never even looked at and valued.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>11 MR. SCARPULLA: Excuse me. There's one other 12 thing I think that Judge Tigar raised in the directs 13 maybe about evidence of what each class member would get 14 if there had been a successful trial as opposed to how 15 much they get in this settlement. And I don't recall 16 seeing that in the record yet.</p> <p>17 MS. MOORE: No, it has not come up in the 18 record, and we've asked multiple times. In LCD we knew 19 exactly what each panel -- the damages were for each 20 panel, for each claimant. So knowing the claims rate 21 and knowing the value of each is vitally important to 22 valuing the settlement. And you can't approve the 23 settlement without that information. And to this day, 24 it's still not in the record. But we know that when 25 Janet Netz made her expert report and valued the whole</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 36</p> <p>1 MR. ALIOTO: I'm pretty sure there is, Your 2 Honor. And I know this for a fact, that we did that 3 analysis. Our expert Janet Netz did that analysis. 4 What was the overcharge on tubes and monitors? It was a 5 higher overcharge. What was the overcharge on tubes in 6 small televisions? What was the overcharge on tubes in 7 large televisions? All of that analysis was done. 8 SPECIAL MASTER: And is in her report -- 9 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: -- which is in the record. 11 MR. ALIOTO: Is in the record. And it may have 12 also been cited when we filed our motion for preliminary 13 approval -- I'm going back a little ways here, but in 14 the northern district there is a rule that as part of a 15 preliminary approval motion, you have to make a -- as 16 part of your prove-up you have to show the damages and 17 the range of damages, and I'm quite sure that that 18 showing was made in our original papers. 19 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. 20 MS. MOORE: Your Honor -- 21 MR. ALIOTO: That's our response to that. 22 MS. MOORE: It wasn't -- it's the panel -- 23 SPECIAL MASTER: You know, we've got to get on 24 with the meat of the objections here. 25 MS. MOORE: Actually --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 35</p> <p>1 case at \$2.7 billion, there must have been an individual 2 damage analysis, which I know there was in LCD.</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: Did you want to respond to 4 that?</p> <p>5 MR. ALIOTO: Well, no. We have certain issues 6 that we came prepared to address, and one of the things 7 that has not been addressed by objectors is the amount 8 of the settlement and the comparability to LCD and did 9 we get enough money. I just want to note for the record 10 we -- we have enough issues to discuss here today. 11 That's something that has not been raised.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: But the point --</p> <p>13 MS. MOORE: Well, it was raised.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Wait, wait. The point that's 15 being made by Ms. Moore is you can't just -- the court 16 can't just say: Okay, 576 million, that's a lot of 17 money, that's okay.</p> <p>18 You have to know or have some sense of the 19 range of the value of each individual class member's 20 claim. And they may be different values depending on 21 how they're situated and what they're going to get in 22 the settlement so that you can compare what a class 23 member would have gotten if they went to trial with what 24 they're getting in the settlement. And Ms. Moore says 25 there's nothing to that effect in the record.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 37</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: I don't want to go on much 2 longer on this.</p> <p>3 MS. MOORE: May I say one thing?</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes.</p> <p>5 MS. MOORE: It is important to this meet the 6 settlement. You need the dollar amount per panel. So 7 we know that for a panel it was \$65 in damages in LCD. 8 We don't have that number in this case, so we can't 9 evaluate it.</p> <p>10 MR. COOPER: I would just request that Mr. 11 Alioto -- we're not aware of where Ms. Netz's report, 12 damage study report for trial is in the record. So I'm 13 not certain what he's referring to.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Was her -- wait, please. 15 Was her deposition taken?</p> <p>16 MR. ALIOTO: Yes.</p> <p>17 MR. COOPER: And filed -- they're not filed. 18 They're not in the clerk's office. They weren't filed. 19 They're not available to generally -- generally to 20 people. We never saw them. We're lawyers in the case, 21 and we weren't allowed to see them.</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: Was her report not made an 23 exhibit to her deposition?</p> <p>24 MR. ALIOTO: It was -- it was an exhibit to her 25 deposition.</p>

10 (Pages 34 - 37)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 38</p> <p>1 MR. COOPER: The deposition was confidential. 2 MR. ALIOTO: But they're counsel of record. 3 They've signed the protective order. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. 5 MS. CAPURRO: It's also in the record. It was 6 filed as part of our opposition to summary judgment. 7 MR. COOPER: Not an unredacted -- 8 SPECIAL MASTER: Was there a -- was there a -- 9 MS. CAPURRO: And it's also referenced in -- 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Was there a Daubert motion? 11 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: There was a Daubert motion. 13 So guess who ruled on it? And so I certainly saw her 14 report. 15 MR. ALIOTO: And when those are filed, Your 16 Honor, they're not in the court record, they're under 17 seal in the court record, but they go by separate email 18 to all of the indirect purchaser counsel because they're 19 parties to the protective order. So these folks have 20 all that information. 21 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 22 MR. BONSIGNORE: I just -- make -- I did not 23 get it by email at all. The information that would be 24 helpful to me in relationship to a case that I had that 25 was -- that we actually succeeded in doing what you're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 40</p> <p>1 MS. KIRKHAM: I'll work on eloquent here and 2 brevity. Brevity perhaps more important than eloquence. 3 In the adequacy -- the adequacy of the 4 settlement with regard to the non-repeater state claims, 5 where we begin is with lead counsel's repeated 6 statements that they value the claims as zero. So I 7 think we can agree that that's been established as a 8 fact. 9 We know that, for example, the 500 plus million 10 dollar settlement is compared in their papers to Dr. 11 Netz's \$2.8 billion damage number. That number is for 12 the 21 damage class states. So those are the purchases 13 that occurred in those states. We don't know -- we 14 could compute it if we actually had a per panel and some 15 information about sales of what it is in the other 16 states, but I don't believe Dr. Netz ever did that. 17 So we have, so we're beginning with the idea 18 that what we have, what you have before you and the real 19 fundamental question you have before you really is are 20 those claims valueless. Are they meritless. And are 21 they so demonstratively meritless that without affording 22 the possessors of those claims, the due process under 23 Rules 12 or 56, you can say that they should be released 24 here. They should be dismissed with prejudice because 25 the effect of approving this settlement is exactly</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 39</p> <p>1 proposing was the claims rate. We don't have any 2 information yet on the claims rate. We don't know if 3 there's a surplus or whether people will get a cut down. 4 The excluded states, according to the terms of the 5 settlement agreement, you'd have to very carefully craft 6 language that would not cause them to waive their rights 7 to proceed in economic recovery. And I'm just going to 8 cut it there. 9 Just with a grain of salt, I approached Mr. 10 Alioto at least a dozen times before today and asked him 11 to let's talk about it. And although he's wide open to 12 the suggestion today, which is very positive, very good, 13 maybe it was something that you said, but before today, 14 he had dug in and wasn't going to change anything. So 15 this is -- you've already made progress. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. So the next issue 17 really I want to talk about is the merits of the -- are 18 the merits of the objections that have been raised to 19 the failure of the allocation plan with any monetary 20 compensation to the residents or the purchasers in the 21 non-repeater states and the three omitted repealer 22 states. 23 So I really don't need all those arguments 24 repeated, but if there's someone has something eloquent 25 to say -- Ms. Kirkham, I see you're raising your hand.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 41</p> <p>1 same effect as a ruling on summary judgment on those 2 claims or a ruling on Rule 12 on those claims. 3 So that's essentially what you're doing, but 4 not in -- not affording them the due process of those 5 procedures. So the claims have to be pretty 6 fundamentally meritless at the courthouse door for that 7 determination not to be made. 8 Now I'm not saying that determination is 9 impossible in a class action settlement, but generally 10 where you find judges and special masters being willing 11 to do that is where you have a situation in which you 12 have a factual disparity between two purported class 13 members so that you can look at one and you say you 14 bought the price fixed product. And in a period that we 15 have evidence that the price was artificially inflated 16 and therefore we say -- I can look at you and say -- for 17 settlement purposes certainly I can say you were 18 injured. 19 And you over here, Mr. Jones, you bought the 20 product, or if it's a securities case, you traded the 21 security during the period that the evidence suggests 22 that the price was in fact competitive. Maybe the 23 conspiracy was still going on, but it fell apart during 24 that period. There's some evidence in the case, some 25 way the person purchased, some evidence that those</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 42</p> <p>1 purchasers did not damage the individual.</p> <p>2 Now we come to the situation that we have</p> <p>3 here -- and I really think that if you read the Sullivan</p> <p>4 case, you can see that the third circuit was coming to</p> <p>5 grips with this idea. Is what we have here is a</p> <p>6 situation in which you have two class members for whom</p> <p>7 you can say they bought the same product under the same</p> <p>8 circumstances, inflated the same way. The only</p> <p>9 difference is that they're standing on opposite sides of</p> <p>10 a geographic boundary called a state line. And on the</p> <p>11 one side of the state line it's we're home free, and on</p> <p>12 the other side of the state line you say you, because of</p> <p>13 that, despite your factual claim, you can't possibly</p> <p>14 recover under the factual claim.</p> <p>15 We don't have that situation here. Illinois</p> <p>16 Brick doesn't do that. Illinois Brick is a rule of</p> <p>17 evidence fundamentally. The Supreme Court was faced</p> <p>18 with the choice it felt of overruling Hanover Shoe and</p> <p>19 allowing defendants to put in evidence of passthrough or</p> <p>20 enunciating a rule that said what's sauce for the goose</p> <p>21 is sauce for the gander, and the plaintiffs can't put</p> <p>22 that evidence into.</p> <p>23 So if you are a plaintiff and you need evidence</p> <p>24 of passthrough in order to establish your claim, you're</p> <p>25 probably out of luck under Illinois Brick. You still</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 44</p> <p>1 predicate of recovery, any recovery which appears in law</p> <p>2 or in equity. The Clayton Act specifically talks about</p> <p>3 affording a recovery that is reversing, undoing the</p> <p>4 overcharges the defendants collected. There is</p> <p>5 nothing -- the Ninth Circuit has never suggested -- in</p> <p>6 fact, the Ninth Circuit has explicitly endorsed that</p> <p>7 that is one of the policies of the antitrust laws.</p> <p>8 The antitrust laws also -- there are tomes that</p> <p>9 talk about the benefits that the antitrust laws convey</p> <p>10 on society as a whole and the benefits of private</p> <p>11 enforcement of those laws convey on society as a whole.</p> <p>12 So there's not been probably a better situation</p> <p>13 where someone is set up to make an equitable claim for</p> <p>14 monetary relief than someone who is acting as a, quote,</p> <p>15 private attorneys general and coming in and vindicating</p> <p>16 a critical tenet of American not only jurisprudence, but</p> <p>17 indeed of American economic theory and practice, and</p> <p>18 that is competition.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: Can I just interrupt a minute?</p> <p>20 Am I correct that the state of the law on recovery of</p> <p>21 equitable monetary relief in non-repealer states is</p> <p>22 number one, everyone agrees there is no federal right to</p> <p>23 such damage?</p> <p>24 MS. KIRKHAM: No, there is.</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: You're saying there is under</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 43</p> <p>1 actually have the right to come into court and attempt</p> <p>2 to show why it doesn't apply to you. It is not a rule</p> <p>3 of standing. It does not bar people at the courthouse</p> <p>4 door, nor is it the indirect purchaser hostility act.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: But why wouldn't it apply --</p> <p>6 you know, assuming it's sound law and the Supreme Court</p> <p>7 doesn't change its mind, why wouldn't it apply to all</p> <p>8 the class members in these states? What would be a</p> <p>9 ground for someone saying I am --</p> <p>10 MS. KIRKHAM: It would --</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: -- I am entitled to make a</p> <p>12 claim as an exception to Illinois Brick?</p> <p>13 MS. KIRKHAM: We're not -- we're not suggesting</p> <p>14 exceptions to Illinois Brick. We're not suggesting</p> <p>15 claims and exceptions to Illinois Brick. We're just</p> <p>16 suggesting claims that fall outside of Illinois Brick.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Such as?</p> <p>18 MS. KIRKHAM: Okay. Such as the claims for</p> <p>19 equitable monetary relief. They do not require proof of</p> <p>20 pass on, and as soon as you have a claim that does not</p> <p>21 require proof of pass on, Illinois Brick becomes a case</p> <p>22 that sits over here and applies to other people.</p> <p>23 What that is a situation in which there is</p> <p>24 the inherent power of the federal court to award in a</p> <p>25 situation in which a person proves that the factual</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 45</p> <p>1 the --</p> <p>2 MS. KIRKHAM: We're talking -- I'm talking</p> <p>3 about someone who comes into federal court and alleges a</p> <p>4 violation of the Sherman Act.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>6 MS. KIRKHAM: Yes.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: And then there are also -- you</p> <p>8 maintain there would be cognizable state law claims for</p> <p>9 equitable monetary relief in these non-repealer states,</p> <p>10 yes?</p> <p>11 MS. KIRKHAM: Umm --</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: No?</p> <p>13 MS. KIRKHAM: Probably not in the non-repealer</p> <p>14 states, only because a lot of their state courts have</p> <p>15 said that -- well, let's put it this way: There</p> <p>16 wouldn't be unjust enrichment. Whether there would be</p> <p>17 the same kind of equitable monetary relief granted</p> <p>18 simply for proof of the violation of the state law,</p> <p>19 because the same argument about Illinois Brick that it's</p> <p>20 a rule of evidence applies when it's applied in state</p> <p>21 court to state law as well as when it's applied in</p> <p>22 federal court to federal law.</p> <p>23 But we're not talking -- there are a lot of</p> <p>24 cases -- the cases that Mr. Alioto is citing about</p> <p>25 unjust enrichment, we agree that they go the way they</p>

12 (Pages 42 - 45)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 go.</p> <p>2 When Illinois Brick first came down, lawyers 3 for plaintiffs tried to avoid Illinois Brick by pleading 4 unjust enrichment claims under state common law and 5 unjust enrichment, and the state court said hmm-mm, 6 we're not going to let you do that. We're not going to 7 let you just recast an antitrust claim as an unjust 8 enrichment claim.</p> <p>9 I'm not talking about going back and trying to 10 do that, to get that reversed, and I am focused and we 11 are focused on the federal recovery -- federal monetary 12 recovery that the court in KeySpan talked about and that 13 the court in LCDs, Judge Illston, talked about when she 14 first analyzed that there's a federal right to this.</p> <p>15 And therefore, the state of Oregon, which was saying we 16 can do it under a state law, she then leapt over and 17 said your state law follows federal law. I think 18 there's a federal right. Then I think there's probably 19 a state right. And that was her decision on that 20 subject. That's why she talks about Oregon law.</p> <p>21 But she's not -- her analysis doesn't begin 22 with Oregon law, it begins with KeySpan, it begins with 23 a federal right that arises under the antitrust laws 24 that if I prove a violation of the antitrust laws, I 25 might not be able to prove pass-on because Illinois</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 that raise the question that the claim is valuable?</p> <p>2 SPECIAL MASTER: You're saying, I guess, that 3 there is a legitimate split of authority on this issue, 4 and, therefore, if there's a split of authority, you 5 can't say the claims are worth zero?</p> <p>6 MS. KIRKHAM: Actually, there's nothing against 7 it. It's just not been litigated. The authority is 8 actually all on the side of the claim. The cases that 9 are cited against it in the briefs are not considering 10 it.</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: They're dealing with state 12 law.</p> <p>13 MS. KIRKHAM: They're dealing with state law 14 unjust enrichment claims or there -- there is the Ninth 15 Circuit case that wouldn't give the certain kind of 16 relief in the motor vehicles case that got cited down 17 the line for people saying so if you can't give federal 18 disgorgement, but when you read the motor vehicles case, 19 that's not what the Ninth Circuit was saying. On -- it 20 wasn't considering this kind of question, and it wasn't 21 saying you can never get money in an equitable situation 22 if you're an antitrust plaintiff.</p> <p>23 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Before I leave you and 24 hear from other people, you cited Judge Renfrew's report 25 and recommendation and you cited like page 300 and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 Brick says I can't. But if I prove this violation, I 2 can ask the court to give me a monetary equitable remedy 3 that is disgorgement or restitution.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I can see that this 5 argument and this line of thought would be a wonderful 6 law review article, but is there any authority out there 7 that says in the federal context that there -- despite 8 Illinois Brick, we are going to allow you to pursue a 9 federal claim for equitable monetary relief?</p> <p>10 MS. KIRKHAM: There is the KeySpan case which 11 dealt with a governmental entity, and there is Judge 12 Illston's decision in LCDs. There is judge -- the 13 adoption by Chief Judge Hamilton of Judge Renfrew's 14 report and recommendation in DRAM. And then there are 15 the cases that we cited and the development of the law 16 this way that we cited in our brief from the antitrust 17 treatise that actually Mr. Varanini knows more about 18 than I do, since he was one of the editors or authors or 19 both.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: And that's it?</p> <p>21 MS. KIRKHAM: And so far that's it.</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>23 MS. KIRKHAM: However, Your Honor, the decision 24 you're making is, is that enough that you can say all of 25 that goes away and zero is the right number, or does</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 something. And the report and recommendation that I 2 have from Judge Renfrew only goes up to page 200.</p> <p>3 Are you referring to some other report.</p> <p>4 MS. KIRKHAM: Yes, the Lexis -- I'm citing to 5 the pages of the -- of Judge Hamilton's order adopting 6 it, which attached the whole thing. So the paging is 7 off. If you've got one from him, you have what he filed 8 in federal court, so you'd have what it looks like in 9 the docket. What I was citing to is a brief. I'm sorry 10 for the confusion -- was a Lexis.</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>12 MS. KIRKHAM: So everyone would be able to have 13 it because you'd have to otherwise go to the DRAM 14 docket.</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Just for everybody's 16 information, I have access to Westlaw. I do not have 17 easy access to Lexis. Just --</p> <p>18 MS. KIRKHAM: We'll send -- Your Honor --</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: -- limited resources at JAMS.</p> <p>20 MS. KIRKHAM: -- I will submit a letter that 21 redoing the citations to the -- I don't know if it's 22 still on Westlaw, but to the docket version, the DRAM 23 docket version of the report and recommendation.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Thank you.</p> <p>25 Now, on this issue, does anyone else have</p>

13 (Pages 46 - 49)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 50</p> <p>1 anything to say? I presume the answer is yes.</p> <p>2 MS. MOORE: I just wanted to point out that in 3 the original settlement in this case with Chunghwa, I 4 believe in their paper -- in the defendants' papers 5 where they were arguing for final approval, they argued 6 what is essentially the equitable monetary relief.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: Who argued it?</p> <p>8 MS. MOORE: Chunghwa, and they said there was a 9 colorable federal claim in all 50 states, and they -- 10 and the papers indicated that everybody would get paid, 11 which is why now here we are years and years and years 12 later and that's not happening.</p> <p>13 So they -- they filed a -- it was the 14 plaintiffs who filed the motion for final approval, and 15 I think there were objections, and the defendants filed 16 an opposition or a reply to those objections, and it's 17 in those papers. I can find them if you want. They're 18 quoted in my original objection papers here, and then I 19 can find them for you if you want.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. All right. Mr. 21 Bonsignore.</p> <p>22 MR. BONSIGNORE: Briefly, Your Honor, there are 23 statutory claims in Massachusetts and New Hampshire, 24 although the New Hampshire ones might have postdated 25 prior to the settlements. New Hampshire also had and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 52</p> <p>1 suggestion in one of the briefs that in the LG release 2 settlement, that the same type of release, same scope of 3 release was -- was given to LG that was given to the 4 defendants in these settlements and nobody raised a 5 peep. Is that true or untrue?</p> <p>6 MR. ALIOTO: That's correct.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>8 MS. MOORE: Your Honor, it becomes more obvious 9 at the time of distribution. A lot of times it's not 10 obvious until we get to distribution and then you 11 realize there are issues.</p> <p>12 MR. BONSIGNORE: I was told by Mr. Alioto -- I 13 put it in my papers. I was told repeatedly that my 14 states would be taken care of at the end. And if I 15 hadn't heard that, I would have been jumping up and down 16 filing, objecting, going and zealously representing my 17 clients. It's horrible that those states are left out, 18 especially Massachusetts, because our law is stronger 19 than the California law. I know it's a debate, but I 20 always say it, and I'm going to say it now. To leave 21 out those states is no excuse. And once the mistake was 22 caught, it should have been corrected instantly. I 23 don't know what someone is thinking to think that that's 24 the way it should go through.</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I really think I need</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 51</p> <p>1 Massachusetts also have common law claims under their 2 consumer protection statutes. I cited those in the 3 brief. In fact, I was involved in both cases, and so I 4 know them very well.</p> <p>5 With regard to Missouri, Missouri was in a 6 similar situation as Massachusetts and New Hampshire was 7 before the supreme court addressed it. And, in fact, 8 the attorney general of Missouri has taken a position 9 that indirect purchaser claims are allowed under those 10 states.</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Missouri is a repealer state, 12 isn't it?</p> <p>13 MR. BONSIGNORE: Yes, it shouldn't be a 14 problem, but if I got to beat a dead horse, I'll beat a 15 dead horse briefly.</p> <p>16 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Consider it 17 beaten.</p> <p>18 MR. BONSIGNORE: Briefly.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: Did you want to respond on 20 this issue? I don't know who is going to do it from 21 your side.</p> <p>22 MR. ALIOTO: I'm going to address it, if you 23 don't mind, Your Honor.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: Before we -- before I give Mr. 25 Alioto a full -- full reign here, wasn't there some</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 53</p> <p>1 to give Mr. Alioto a chance here or his designee.</p> <p>2 MR. ALIOTO: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>3 Just for the record, Mr. Bonsignore's --</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: And let me focus your --</p> <p>5 MR. ALIOTO: -- statements about what I said 6 and what I didn't say, I'm not going to go into that.</p> <p>7 It's not evidence, but I want the record to be clear on 8 that. But go ahead, Your Honor, excuse me.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Yeah, I mean the -- I really 10 understand all the arguments you've raised, but the core 11 question is is there a split of authority here, a 12 legitimate, not concocted, but a legitimate split of 13 authority as to whether there is a federal right of 14 action that indirect purchasers in non-repeater states 15 could pursue? And if there is that split of authority, 16 how -- how is it reasonable to value the claims at zero.</p> <p>17 MR. ALIOTO: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>18 I'd like to answer that, but I'd like to give Your Honor 19 the full picture of how these cases get settled and how 20 lead counsel in the exercise of his discretion --</p> <p>21 MR. SCARPULLA: We cannot hear down here, Mr. 22 Alioto. I'm sorry. He has to speak up.</p> <p>23 MR. ALIOTO: I think it would be important to 24 -- for Your Honor to hear the complete facts because 25 when we settle one of these cases, it's based certainly</p>

14 (Pages 50 - 53)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 54</p> <p>1 on the underlying law, the viability of claims. It's 2 based on the statute of limitations. It's based on 3 other things as well, and this is very important. This 4 is -- we're going to talk about notice or maybe we're 5 not going on talk about notice.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes, we are.</p> <p>7 MR. ALIOTO: We are going to talk about. Well, 8 maybe I can -- I can give a little preview on the notice 9 because it really has to do with the valuation of claims 10 and how we arrived at this settlement. And I know this 11 is all in the papers, but it's -- it's not -- maybe it's 12 not as clear as it can be how this notice program and 13 how the history of this case informed my decision to 14 settle on the basis that we did.</p> <p>15 And by that I mean this: There have been three 16 nationwide notices in this case: Chunghwa, LG -- the LG 17 was actually a combined notice of the LG settlement and 18 a notice of class certification, but that was a separate 19 nationwide notice. Very similar to this third notice 20 when all the bells and whistles, newspaper, Internet, 21 email, very, very extensive. Three programs, massive 22 notice programs.</p> <p>23 The direct purchasers, they may have even given 24 more notices because I think they did their settlements 25 differently. They may have had separate settlements,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 56</p> <p>1 classes not certified, who the claimants are. It's a 2 very comprehensive report by 52 -- by the defendant to 3 52 attorneys general and the Department of Justice. 4 I'll just hand that up to you for your 5 reference.</p> <p>6 The point I want to make there, Your Honor, is 7 that in this case, there have been nine settlements, so 8 nine defendants, if my math is right, each of those nine 9 defendants sent out 51 CAFA notices. Each defendant 10 notified every state attorney general in the United 11 States, and each defendant notified the Department of 12 Justice. By my calculation that's 459 CAFA notices to 13 the highest ranking law enforcement officials in every 14 state.</p> <p>15 Where are the attorney generals saying there's 16 viable law and I'm going to bring a case? Where are the 17 attorneys general, people, law enforcement officers, not 18 people with axes to grind or not people with agendas, 19 law enforcement officers, where is the response to those 20 CAFA notices?</p> <p>21 Well, one response is Mr. Varanini. He's in 22 here, but he doesn't have any problem with the issues 23 that are being raised by these objectors. I just want 24 Your Honor to be aware of these issues. They're out 25 there. They're out in the public domain, notices given</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 55</p> <p>1 and they didn't lump them. And there were at least 2 three notices in the direct case.</p> <p>3 Now those notices were targeted at direct 4 purchasers, but they were nationwide in scope. There's 5 publication in the Wall Street Journal, there's 6 publication in other publications. There's wide 7 dissemination. So you have six notices.</p> <p>8 These claims and these cases, and these -- this 9 litigation against these defendants for these products, 10 it's no secret. This has been going on for eight years.</p> <p>11 There's also reference in the brief to 12 something known as a CAFA notice, and we just kind of -- 13 kind of make passing mention to this. This is really 14 not part of our notice program. It's something that 15 defendants are required to do under the Class Action 16 Fairness Act. Every time there's a preliminary approval 17 in one of these indirect purchaser cases, each defendant 18 who has settled and is going to be -- and their 19 settlement is going to be proposed for preliminary 20 approval, they prepare a CAFA notice. This is what one 21 looks like.</p> <p>22 It's very comprehensive. It sends the attorney 23 general, attorneys general, all 50 of them all of the 24 important documents in the case: the notices, the 25 evidence, the rulings, the classes certified, the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 57</p> <p>1 to the people that are charged with making these 2 decisions. And when you don't hear anything from any AG 3 and there's no reaction and no -- certainly no contest 4 or no challenge by those law enforcement officers, that 5 really weighs heavily in my decision.</p> <p>6 Let me add to that this: Let's not forget the 7 importance of opt-outs. Is there someone -- of course 8 this debate is not about, as you say, it's not a law 9 review debate. It's not about these claims and are they 10 viable and is there -- is there law. This is not an 11 academic debate. This is a debate about is there a 12 client out there with a lawyer who wants to bring a 13 claim or is sitting on the sidelines thinking about 14 bringing a claim and we're wiping his rights out. 15 That's the issue.</p> <p>16 It is highly, highly, highly improbable that 17 someone is going to step forward and assert some claim 18 against these defendants for a global cartel and seek to 19 establish damages on an individual basis and probably 20 even more difficult on a class basis for -- for one 21 state.</p> <p>22 These kinds of things go into my analysis as 23 lead counsel in consultation with people that I'm 24 working with in the case, which are some of the best 25 people you can possibly work with in these cases. This</p>

15 (Pages 54 - 57)

<p>1 is what goes into my analysis.</p> <p>2 So is it science? Yes, it's science. We 3 review the law. We look at the standing issues. We 4 look at statute of limitations issues. We also take 5 this pragmatic approach: What is the -- what is the 6 risk or what is the chance that after this case has been 7 around for eight years with multiple notices, with 459 8 notices to the attorneys general and the Department of 9 Justice, what's the chance that there is a live claim 10 somewhere out there that's being compromised? Almost 11 nil, Your Honor. You can't say zero, you can never say 12 zero, but I would say it's close to zero as you could 13 possibly get.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So -- but you have to 15 notice that the difference between what was done here 16 and what was done in LCD, accepting your point that 17 claims by -- for any kind of monetary relief by people 18 in non-repeater states would be very challenging, would 19 be an uphill battle, accepting that, still the 20 defendants in this case I take it insisted on a release, 21 whereas in LCD those claims, as I remember, were not 22 released; that is, whatever claims, weak or strong, that 23 people in non-repeater states had for monetary relief, 24 were -- were not released in the settlement.</p> <p>25 I don't know if my memory is right, but I think</p>	<p>Page 58</p> <p>1 afford him a remedy. That's what we're referring to 2 here. Viable. Does the law support the claims if the 3 facts bear it out.</p> <p>4 That concept gets lost and gets confused with 5 this question of nuisance claims or -- or these un- -- 6 unproven claims. Nuisance claims. And I -- I don't 7 think it's a good idea, and I don't think the class 8 action law in fashioning these settlements ought to be 9 giving consideration to be giving payments to claimants 10 for nuisance claims because sometimes you can get 11 payment on a claim if it's not viable.</p> <p>12 So to the extent that's being suggested, and I 13 think it is. Look, don't wash those claims out for 14 nothing because those people could have asserted these 15 claims and they could have gotten something. Well, they 16 could have gotten something, but it would have been on a 17 nuisance basis. I think that's very important to keep 18 that distinction.</p> <p>19 The other -- not to repeat what's in the 20 briefs, but recently Judge Tigar in approving the 21 settlements in the direct purchaser case, he took note 22 of and was very important factors for him the number of 23 objectors and the number of opt-outs.</p> <p>24 Here we have a very small number of objectors 25 and we've given you some background on those objectors,</p>
<p>1 that's the case.</p> <p>2 MS. KIRKHAM: Yes.</p> <p>3 MR. GOLDBERG: That's correct.</p> <p>4 MR. ALIOTO: Yeah. Now, LCD here --</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: So here the defendants got 6 releases, in LCD they didn't. There could have been a 7 thousand reasons for that. And it's -- I don't want to 8 go into them but...</p> <p>9 MR. ALIOTO: Well, I don't know that there's a 10 thousand, but there are different -- there were 11 different reasons because you had claims by AGs in that 12 case, actual pending claims that were different from 13 claims that were alleged as the classes, and there were 14 viable pending claims. But when you come right down to 15 it, the question is was it reasonable to settle these 16 claims. And I want to just focus on this distinction 17 for a minute because this is very important.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Before you take another 19 breath, how is the court reporter doing?</p> <p>20 THE REPORTER: I'm okay.</p> <p>21 MR. ALIOTO: Okay. Remember, we throw these 22 terms around loosely or I try not to throw these terms 23 around loosely, but I want to focus on viable claim.</p> <p>24 Viable claim means you analyze something, and that means 25 that if someone can provide the facts, the law will</p>	<p>Page 59</p> <p>1 where they're coming from, and a couple of those 2 objectors have already dropped their objections. But 3 you have a pretty good record on what those objectors 4 are about. We have three opt-outs in this case after 5 eight years, after multiple notices, after 459 CAFA 6 notices.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: Were any of those in -- were 8 any of those in non-repeater states?</p> <p>9 MR. ALIOTO: I don't know the answer to that 10 question.</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. ALIOTO: But I want to emphasize this 13 opt-out mechanism because it's very important. That's 14 what protects someone who thinks they have a claim or 15 that wants to make new law or wants to go off on 16 unproven ground and assert something. They have the 17 opportunity to do that, and you can't just pooh-pooh it.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Fair point. I think I know 19 the impact of opt-outs.</p> <p>20 MR. ALIOTO: All right. So that's the notice 21 component, but it also bears on the -- on the releases. 22 This class has had probably unprecedented notice with 23 multiple -- with multiple notifications. That's 24 important. So how did we come to the -- our conclusion? 25 It's all in the brief. The injunctive relief, not</p>

16 (Pages 58 - 61)

<p>1 viable. They're out of the business. Sure, I could 2 have gone to the defendants and said -- 3 SPECIAL MASTER: I get injunctive relief. 4 MR. ALIOTO: Okay. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: The real -- again, just 6 tentatively, I'm not so troubled by the injunctive 7 relief issue. I'm not so troubled by the damage issue. 8 The issue that is more troublesome is this one of 9 equitable monetary relief.</p> <p>10 MR. ALIOTO: Yes, and Your Honor, I'll just say 11 this -- it's in my papers -- it's completely 12 speculative. There is no claim. There is no client. 13 There is no lawyer. There is no lawsuit.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Was a claim -- I -- it would 15 be helpful to me, Lauren, if you could see that I get 16 copies of or give me the docket numbers or something so 17 I can easily find copies of the four complaints in this 18 case, because I want to know what -- what was actually 19 alleged. Was there ever a claim either for injunctive 20 relief or equitable relief or damages asserted on behalf 21 of the people in either the non-repealer states or the 22 three omitted repealer states? Was there ever a claim 23 asserted and was it ultimately dismissed? What happened 24 to it?</p> <p>25 MR. ALIOTO: Yes, it was asserted. It was</p>	<p>Page 62</p> <p>1 question -- 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Oh, don't do that. 3 MR. DUNCAN: -- and the federal disgorgement 4 claim. So the question is whether there's a split of 5 authority, whether it's in some sense viable. The 6 answer's no. There's not a split of authority. At most 7 it's a hypothetical law review article that someone 8 might want to write.</p> <p>9 The Illinois Brick is the law of the land. 10 It's been the law of the land for 40 years. If you 11 could end run Illinois Brick simply by filing a federal 12 disgorgement claim, Illinois Brick wouldn't exist, and 13 people would do that. That's the way these cases would 14 be litigated.</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: Did any court ever say that? 16 MR. DUNCAN: Absolutely. We've cited one case, 17 a Ninth Circuit case that's controlling that says there 18 is no disgorgement remedy under a private plaintiff 19 under a federal law.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>21 MR. DUNCAN: That's in our most recent reply 22 brief. There's a Northern District of California case 23 to the same effect. If you went around the country, 24 every time someone has tried to end run Illinois Brick 25 in this fashion, I'm aware of no case where a private</p>
<p>1 never formally dismissed. It -- it -- it lingered on 2 through the life of the case.</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: So if I look in the fourth 4 amended complaint, will I find it?</p> <p>5 MR. ALIOTO: Yes.</p> <p>6 MR. COOPER: It's pending is the answer.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: So it's there.</p> <p>8 MR. COOPER: It's pending.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: It's in the works. It was 10 never --</p> <p>11 MR. ALIOTO: It's an allegation.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: Right.</p> <p>13 MS. CAPURRO: There was no injunctive relief 14 class certified at the class certification.</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: Right. Okay.</p> <p>16 MR. COOPER: It was pending.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. Bonsignore, you're just 18 going to have to chill down there and sit down. I'll 19 get to you.</p> <p>20 MR. ALIOTO: All right. Your Honor, if you 21 don't mind, I'd just like to have my colleague make just 22 a couple of remarks on this maybe to just sharpen some 23 of these issues up, Mr. Duncan.</p> <p>24 MR. DUNCAN: Your Honor, just very briefly, I 25 want to cut to the chase on the Illinois Brick</p>	<p>Page 63</p> <p>1 class or private plaintiff have been allowed to pursue 2 those claims.</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>4 MR. DUNCAN: Now the objectors have stated that 5 governments -- it's arguably an open question whether a 6 government body can make use of a disgorgement remedy. 7 Private plaintiff --</p> <p>8 SPECIAL MASTER: So it's the State of Oregon?</p> <p>9 MR. DUNCAN: Correct.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I thought I heard 11 Ms. Kirkham suggest that there were cases that said no 12 end run with respect to state law.</p> <p>13 MR. DUNCAN: That's absolutely true also.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: But that there were no cases 15 with respect to the federal Clayton Act, Sherman Act.</p> <p>16 MR. DUNCAN: That's not true. The cases hold 17 to the contrary.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: And you've cited those in your 19 --</p> <p>20 MR. DUNCAN: Some of them, and there are others 21 in other circuits. We've cited the Ninth Circuit law.</p> <p>22 MS. KIRKHAM: Your Honor, this is an 23 interesting point. You're saying that there is a case 24 in which an antitrust price fixing class or plaintiff 25 tried to bring an equitable monetary claim, and the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 Ninth Circuit said Illinois Brick barred that claim 2 because you cannot end run -- 3 MR. DUNCAN: That's not what I said. What the 4 Ninth Circuit held is that there is no disgorgement 5 remedy for a private plaintiff, not a class case. We're 6 not talking about class action. No private plaintiff 7 has a disgorgement remedy under Section 16, period. 8 It's a square hole, and there's -- the law is uniform on 9 that point nationwide.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I don't want any more 11 argument about what the case says because we can read 12 it, so -- and make our own judgment for better or worse.</p> <p>13 MS. KIRKHAM: I also would just like to mention 14 that in LCD Oregon was acting as a private plaintiff.</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: Right.</p> <p>16 MS. KIRKHAM: It had a parens patriae claim. 17 It was not acting --</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>19 MS. KIRKHAM: You know that.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: I do know that. 21 Okay. I'm thinking of taking a break if we 22 have beaten this issue to death. If there are other 23 people in the room who have something to say on the 24 repealer, you know, non-repealer issue and it's not too 25 long, let's get it out.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 to him, I became apoplectic, as you noticed. I request 2 only to be able to supplement the record based on his 3 statements. I submitted evidence, unequivocal evidence 4 that Mr. Alioto was aware of plaintiffs in Massachusetts 5 and New Hampshire and Missouri and that he ignored them. 6 He wasn't even aware that he was aware. There were 7 emails to him. After he was reminded, they changed 8 their argument in their reply brief.</p> <p>9 So in light of the fact that he made an 10 absolute false statement that can be objectively blown 11 up with the allowance of my supplement, I would request 12 that formally.</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Any requests to 14 supplement the record should be made in writing.</p> <p>15 Yes, sir?</p> <p>16 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Yes, Your Honor, again Mike 17 Scarborough for the Samsung SDI defendants. 18 With respect to Massachusetts just, you know, 19 this case goes a long way back. There was a claim on 20 behalf of Massachusetts consumers originally brought in 21 the case. We filed, defendants, multiple motions to 22 dismiss, and we had very able opposition to those 23 motions from lead counsel. Those were hard fought 24 battles, and ultimately I believe it was two different 25 rounds of motions to dismiss, and we had various attacks</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 Mr. Bonsignore, you've been very active down 2 there.</p> <p>3 MR. BONSIGNORE: As to the allegation that 4 there was a nuisance claim with regard to the three 5 excluded states, there were no nuisance claims involved. 6 The Massachusetts statute allows for treble damages and 7 attorneys fees. The New Hampshire allows for punitive 8 damages and attorneys fees. I'm less familiar with 9 Missouri, but I'll rely on those two.</p> <p>10 Mr. Alioto seeks to personalize the issues and 11 play the blame game, blaming the victims for not 12 objecting, blaming lawyers for not being present, and I 13 would like to remind him that lead counsel in a 14 nationwide class action is obligated to represent the 15 interests of all class plaintiffs including the named 16 and unnamed plaintiffs in each and every state 17 encompassed within the class they seek to represent. 18 That's Radcliffe, 715 F.3d 1.57 at 1167.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: These points have been made 20 very cogently and repeatedly in the briefs.</p> <p>21 MR. BONSIGNORE: Okay. Then I would -- then 22 I'll -- I'll just skip over the law. I'm sure you've 23 read it.</p> <p>24 As to the statements that Mr. Alioto was making 25 that there were no lawyers and no plaintiffs available</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 on that claim mostly on procedural bases. Defendants 2 won. So it was a claim that was litigated extensively 3 and that was thrown out, and defendants prevailed on a 4 motion to dismiss.</p> <p>5 MR. BONSIGNORE: In response, Your Honor --</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Wait, wait, wait.</p> <p>7 MR. BONSIGNORE: Okay.</p> <p>8 SPECIAL MASTER: I just need to do this one by 9 one. As I understand it, Judge Legge finally lost 10 patience and dismissed the claim for failure to make 11 some what he considered necessary allegation. The 12 defendants prevailed. The claim was gone. But Judge 13 Legge said in his -- in his decision this would not bar, 14 you know, the bringing of a valid claim later on.</p> <p>15 Do I have it right.</p> <p>16 MR. SCARBOROUGH: I'm not -- again, it's been a 17 while since I looked at these papers.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: That's just what --</p> <p>19 MR. SCARBOROUGH: I don't know if that last 20 part is correct necessarily, but I don't think it was 21 necessarily an invitation for lead counsel to pursue 22 such a claim.</p> <p>23 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>24 MR. BONSIGNORE: Your Honor, lead counsel is 25 the only person who has the responsibility to do that.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 And beyond that on that point, it was a procedural issue 2 that could have been corrected in three seconds by the 3 issuance of a subsequent demand letter, and it would be 4 totaling, it would go back, and that would be that. 5 And I will also point to <i>Kayes versus Pacific</i> 6 Lumber Company 51 F.3d 1449 -- 7 SPECIAL MASTER: We can't -- if you're citing 8 cases that aren't in your brief, I -- 9 MR. BONSIGNORE: No, they're in the brief. I'm 10 just reminding -- I'm highlighting them. <i>Kayes versus</i> 11 Pac. Lumber, 51 F.3d 1449. The responsibility of class 12 counsel to absent class members whose control over their 13 attorneys is limited. And that's the point that I'm 14 making. The class members, lawyers other than lead 15 counsel, and more in this case than any other case I've 16 been in, had no sway whatsoever. He ran it like a 17 dictatorship. We had no control. All we could do was 18 argue and complain. 19 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Thank you. 20 Ms. Moore, final, final, yes. 21 MS. MOORE: With regards to Massachusetts, Your 22 Honor, an error was made. An error was made two times. 23 It could -- Massachusetts could still have been valued 24 and put in the settlement and was not. And this is a 25 case in LCD. We just -- between Massachusetts and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 to unearth claims, to create claims? 2 MS. MOORE: Well, actually, even in this case 3 it isn't even relevant because we had plaintiffs. But 4 yes, I do think he should do that, and, in fact, there's 5 law that -- 6 SPECIAL MASTER: You had plaintiffs in 7 Massachusetts. Did you have plaintiffs in New Hampshire 8 and Missouri? 9 MS. MOORE: Yes. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 11 MS. MOORE: They existed. 12 SPECIAL MASTER: And what happened to them? 13 MS. MOORE: They just were never pursued. They 14 were just abandoned. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 16 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Your Honor, just one very 17 quick point to add on Massachusetts. As I recall, there 18 were attempts to cure the defect with the -- it was 19 basically sending a demand letter, and lead counsel did, 20 and whatever associated Massachusetts counsel did try 21 and fix that defect. The defendants argued at that 22 point you couldn't do it. You couldn't fix it. This 23 was not a problem that could be remediated, and the 24 claim had to be thrown out. 25 And as I recall it, that was the view that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 Missouri, my partial investigation -- I haven't talked 2 to all the aggregators, but there was 41 and a half 3 million dollars distributed in LCD between those two 4 states alone. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Well, let me -- 6 MS. MOORE: So this is a valuable case that 7 they could have valued and put in the settlement and 8 they chose not to. 9 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Is it the duty of lead 10 counsel -- and I know we have a number of people in the 11 room who have served as lead counsel. Is it the duty of 12 lead counsel to go around to every state and phone 13 lawyers and say, you know, go make a claim, go scrounge 14 around and get a class representative. Is that part of 15 the fiduciary duty of lead counsel? 16 No, Mr. Bonsignore. 17 Go ahead. 18 MS. MOORE: Yes, Your Honor, I think he's 19 putative counsel -- he's counsel -- lead counsel is 20 appointed and is given this duty, and it is his 21 responsibility to make sure that these claims are 22 pursued. And I do think he has a right to make sure -- 23 SPECIAL MASTER: But is it his duty -- 24 MS. MOORE: -- that people are not left out. 25 SPECIAL MASTER: Is it his duty to find claims,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 prevailed with Judge Legge. So these arguments to the 2 contrary that hey, this was simply send a later demand 3 letter and it can all be fixed is just not true, it's 4 just not what Judge Legge found. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: I'm going to ask and then 6 we're going to take a break. I want someone to tell me 7 dispassionately without a lot of adjectives and 8 invective what happened in New Hampshire and what 9 happened in Missouri. 10 No, I'm going to get another volunteer, Mr. 11 Bonsignore. 12 MS. MOORE: The claims were never filed. There 13 was never a claim filed -- 14 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I'm going to ask -- 15 MS. MOORE: -- by lead counsel. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: Ms. Moore, thank you. 17 Go ahead. 18 MR. ALIOTO: Thank you, Your Honor. From lead 19 counsel's perspective, you can only bring claims for 20 those people who stepped forward and wanted to assert a 21 claim. We gathered all of the claims, all of the 22 complaints that were filed at the institution of the 23 case. We reviewed those. Some -- there was an 24 extensive vetting process that went on for months. Some 25 claimants survived that process. Others didn't.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 There were also discussions as the case went on 2 to -- to the later years of the case. There were 3 discussions about other class representatives, 4 discussions with lawyers who thought they had clients, 5 and those were vetted up the line and eventually to me, 6 and decisions were made as to the viability of 7 plaintiffs.</p> <p>8 SPECIAL MASTER: So what happened in New 9 Hampshire and Missouri?</p> <p>10 MR. ALIOTO: There was never any plaintiff that 11 I -- certainly I didn't represent anyone, and no 12 plaintiff in Missouri was ever brought to my attention 13 as being out there and wanting to press a suit. That is 14 the absolute fact.</p> <p>15 It was, as is the case in a lot of these 16 multistate cases, sometimes there are not claimants for 17 these states. This is a big responsibility, Your Honor, 18 to step up in one of these cases. You know what goes 19 into that.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. What about New 21 Hampshire?</p> <p>22 MR. ALIOTO: I don't believe there was ever a 23 client proffered. Mr. Bonsignore has mentioned 24 something in his papers about late in the game that 25 there was a -- he had someone and someone was ready to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 Mr. Alioto, you didn't do this and Mr. Alioto, you 2 didn't do that, well, we did \$576 million worth of right 3 things. And that's what we're trying to get approved. 4 And this is -- with all due respect to these objectors, 5 this is just -- let me say it's a side show. Thank you.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. We're going to take a 7 break now for like ten minutes, and then we'll come back 8 and deal with the other issues. Thank you.</p> <p>9 (Recess 11:34 a.m. to 11:47 a.m.)</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: I'd like to move on to the 11 notice issue. If anybody has anything more to say on 12 this repealer issue, you can say it at the end when I 13 give you a chance to raise any issues that haven't 14 otherwise been raised. But we need to cover the 15 waterfront here, so I'd like to move on to the issue of 16 whether the notice was adequate again.</p> <p>17 I've read the briefs, I understand the problems 18 that have been raised with the notice. I understand the 19 responses of lead counsel and the declaration -- various 20 declarations of Mr. Fisher. So, you know, I think I'm 21 pretty well up to speed on this, but I'd like to hear -- 22 give you a chance to say anything that needs saying.</p> <p>23 Anyone from the objectors side like to be heard 24 on this issue?</p> <p>25 MR. SCARPULLA: Francis Scarpulla, Your Honor.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 go. I viewed that with extreme caution because when you 2 make a decision like that to put somebody forward for a 3 state, it's very important. It's not only important for 4 that state, it's important for the whole case.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: I remember your briefing on 6 this point now.</p> <p>7 MR. ALIOTO: The statute had run. The simple 8 answer is without the invectives, the statute had run at 9 the time he brought that up.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>11 MR. ALIOTO: But can I make one point without 12 invective or adjective? We have quite a different view 13 about abandoning and not representing and, you know, 14 sloughing people off. But, you know, the simple answer 15 to that is Ms. Moore and Mr. Bonsignore and all these 16 other people after the fact, you got the papers. You 17 know what classes are represented and are not 18 represented. Go out to the federal courthouse. File a 19 complaint. The complaint will be transferred into this 20 district, and we would love nothing more for them to 21 have done that at the time.</p> <p>22 I can't dictate to them. If they had a client 23 and they felt strongly about this, file a case, it will 24 be transferred in, and we'll deal with it. But after 25 the fact, you know, after the money is in the bank and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 I think we said it pretty much in our brief, and I am 2 not going to repeat that. We just would urge that Your 3 Honor may wish to consider hiring an independent expert 4 to opine on it.</p> <p>5 Now I've done a hundred-plus notices, and so 6 when you see one where the only evidence -- where the 7 only hard evidence you have is a reach of 58 percent, 8 then there is a problem, especially since as Mr. Fisher 9 points out, if you use the early years, the class 10 members were between six years old at the start of the 11 period and 18 at the end of it if you use his early 12 years. I don't even think they had -- even at the end 13 of the period, 18 year olds don't have the right to form 14 contracts. Put that aside.</p> <p>15 If you use his later years, then it's 12 to 22. 16 I'm sorry, 10 to 22. Those are -- that's the ages of 17 the people that he targeted during the -- during the 18 period of the -- of the price fixing.</p> <p>19 And again, those TVs as -- as the LCDs came 20 into the market, there was a great decline in the sales 21 of CRTs, and they were being bought by individual family 22 units that didn't have a lot of money because they were 23 much cheaper than the LCDs. And to target someone who 24 had income of 60,000 or more misses a whole group of 25 those individual class members.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 78</p> <p>1 And one thing that Your Honor may ask for, 2 which I have not been able to get, I don't know the 3 number of individuals, human beings who have made 4 claims, and that's something that I would respectfully 5 suggest Your Honor may wish to find out.</p> <p>6 Now we know that there are the big corporations 7 that put in claims, but the question is how many natural 8 persons put in claims. So I'm not going to repeat 9 anything else in the brief.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. You said the only hard 11 evidence is that the reach was 58 percent. I mean Mr. 12 Fisher says it was 83 percent. Why is that not hard 13 evidence?</p> <p>14 MR. SCARPULLA: Because he's saying -- he's 15 saying I think our Internet reached so many people, but 16 there's nothing -- you have no hard evidence that 17 anybody saw it or that they did anything about it.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: So I don't know how many 19 clicks and so on?</p> <p>20 MR. SCARPULLA: You have no idea.</p> <p>21 SPECIAL MASTER: All right.</p> <p>22 MR. SCARPULLA: And in fact, Your Honor, they 23 had to come to the DRAM database and get that database 24 from us to send out supplemental notices because the 25 notice program was so -- was so flawed.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 80</p> <p>1 preliminary approval stage. Everything that was going 2 to be done notice-wise was vetted then. It was done. 3 There's an extensive record at this point about 4 everything that was done and the effectiveness of it.</p> <p>5 To speak briefly to the point that there's no 6 hard evidence about the reach statistic, that's just 7 wrong. I mean, Mr. Fisher's declaration includes 8 exhibits that say, you know, for the digital outreach 9 precisely what was done, the number of impressions.</p> <p>10 Google, for example. Google is the search engine.</p> <p>11 There were Google banner ads done throughout the Google 12 ad network. Google search results, paid search results 13 were returned. This is just one example of the digital 14 outreach. Two hundred million plus impressions on that 15 kind of thing. And the data is in Mr. Fisher's 16 declaration.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: By impressions, what do you 18 mean?</p> <p>19 MR. DUNCAN: Well, by impressions, that means 20 that when something in the Google network, in the Google 21 ad network website is visited, there's a banner ad that 22 someone sees. Now whether they actually click on that, 23 you don't know. We don't have that data. But you know 24 that someone saw the banner ad within the network. And 25 so that's what the impression data does. And there's a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 79</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Good. Anyone else have 2 anything to add on this issue?</p> <p>3 Mr. Alioto, why would it not be interesting to 4 know this data: How many claims have been submitted, 5 what's the dollar volume, what's the -- where are they 6 from, how many are natural individuals, how many are 7 from the state of California to satisfy the attorney 8 general? Why would it not be interesting to know that 9 and evidently has not been made available?</p> <p>10 MR. ALIOTO: Yes, thank you, Your Honor. Mr. 11 Duncan and Mr. Novak are going to be responding to those 12 notice issues.</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Duncan.</p> <p>14 MR. DUNCAN: Sure. Your Honor, Matthew Duncan 15 from Fine Kaplan again.</p> <p>16 I think -- I think in a vacuum that information 17 will be interesting. The problem -- the issue is that 18 the process is ongoing. Claims are still -- many were 19 received at the end. The claims administrator is still 20 processing that and then certainly that information is 21 going to be known to the court. The issue is that it's 22 not -- it's not germane to settlement approval and 23 whether the standard for notice is met ex ante.</p> <p>24 So bear in mind, the extent to which all of 25 these issues were considered exhaustively at the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 81</p> <p>1 long list of digital outreach that was done. We have 2 the impression data for all of that. And then what Mr. 3 Fisher does is feed that data into the comScore system, 4 which is what marketing professionals and everyone else 5 uses to do this, to calculate the reach.</p> <p>6 So at the end of the day, Mr. Fisher has 7 explained what he did. He's given you the data that 8 went into comScore and then the comScore is the upshot 9 of all of that. And nobody has really -- it's the way 10 it's done, and nobody has shown otherwise in any of the 11 projections.</p> <p>12 So the reach is the reach. It's well within 13 the standard. It's -- it's best -- best practicable 14 notice for all of those reasons, and we think the record 15 is more than robust to find the notice requirements have 16 been met.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: So when -- when would you 18 expect to provide this information to the court assuming 19 I don't tell you to do it sooner at the -- at the time 20 the final papers are filed on the motion for final 21 approval?</p> <p>22 MR. DUNCAN: I think Mr. Alioto probably knows 23 a little bit more about this than I do. But 24 conceptually, I mean, that's part of the claims process 25 reporting that would happen at the allocation phase.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 82</p> <p>1 MR. ALIOTO: We intend to be doing that, 2 although there is this issue raised by the state of 3 California about extending the deadline, so to the 4 extent it's extended, you won't have it complete until 5 that deadline runs.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: But can't we know how things 7 stand now? I mean, I understand the argument that a 8 court has to evaluate a notice program ex ante before it 9 knows how it's actually going to work and make a 10 decision as to whether it's the best practicable. And 11 the court here has done that. But gosh, just common 12 sense tells you it might be nice to see what the results 13 are.</p> <p>14 MR. ALIOTO: I will check with the 15 administrator today and report on where he is and 16 whether and when that information can be made available.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: And if it's robust, I should 18 think you'd be the first one to be trotting it out 19 there.</p> <p>20 Okay. Anything else on notice? Let's see if I 21 have any questions.</p> <p>22 MR. COOPER: Your Honor, I assume that our 23 suggestion about an independent expert is something 24 you're considering? I mean, I'm not asking for a 25 response. I just -- you haven't rejected it?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 84</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Or the absence of flaws. If I 2 hire an independent expert --</p> <p>3 MR. SCARPULLA: -- or absence of it.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: -- not one that you suggested, 5 if I hire an independent expert --</p> <p>6 MR. SCARPULLA: Correct.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: -- he might say or she might 8 say everything is dandy.</p> <p>9 MR. SCARPULLA: You're absolutely right.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Is that correct?</p> <p>11 MR. SCARPULLA: That's absolutely correct. And 12 then you -- Mr. Fisher was a former lawyer who didn't 13 make it in the practice of law and decided to go into 14 this business. You can't do --</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: We all make life choices.</p> <p>16 MR. SCARPULLA: You can't do nationwide notice 17 of any significance for \$1.5 million. That's not 18 possible.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: I noted that figure.</p> <p>20 MR. SCARPULLA: It would cost at least 4 or 5 21 million to get the kind of reach to 80 or plus percent, 22 and that's the whole point of having an independent 23 expert.</p> <p>24 MR. COOPER: I would just say, Your Honor, that 25 I think you put your finger on it. This is an</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 83</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: I know -- I have not rejected 2 it.</p> <p>3 MR. COOPER: Right.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: I mean -- say I were to do 5 that. What -- what different information would they -- 6 I mean I guess they might provide an opinion that's 7 different than Mr. Fisher's opinion, but then I just 8 have a battle of experts, and how has the ball been 9 advanced?</p> <p>10 MR. DUNCAN: Your Honor, that's a good point 11 and it is -- Mr. Fisher is an expert. He's done this 12 many times. His CV is in the record. Everything he's 13 done is in the record, and all of this would lead at 14 most to quibbling about how a different expert might do 15 something slightly differently at the margin. And 16 that's not the standard for whether notice is 17 reasonable. The standard is whether it's reasonable on 18 its own terms, not whether different lawyers might have 19 done something differently on margin or whatever.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Scarpulla or Mr. 21 Cooper, or you can both speak at once.</p> <p>22 MR. SCARPULLA: Yes, Your Honor, the reason 23 that you -- the reason for an independent expert is so 24 that he or she can tell you the flaws in the notice 25 program that Fisher -- Fisher is --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 85</p> <p>1 independent expert, someone that works for the court 2 who's not in an advocacy position. It's not like you 3 get two sides putting up their own experts who are 4 advocating for the two sides. This is someone who would 5 evaluate it, and give you an independent view. And I 6 think that's a totally different thing. You'd have 7 to -- they might say it was fabulous and put an end to 8 all these questions about notice.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Or they might be competitors 10 of Mr. Fisher and love to get a whack at him, you know, 11 so...</p> <p>12 MR. COOPER: Well, I guess that's a theoretical 13 possibility but...</p> <p>14 MR. ALIOTO: Your Honor, let's not forget, when 15 we were working on the schedule, and the objectors 16 needed all of this time and this elongated schedule, 17 there were statements made by Mr. Scarpulla that he 18 needed time to retain an expert. Well, he got the time, 19 but he has not retained an expert. Instead, he's come 20 in and said well, we're not going to retain anybody. We 21 want you to go get an independent expert. There's no 22 basis on this record to do that, especially after he 23 initially indicated that he was going to pursue that 24 himself.</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Bonsignore?</p>

22 (Pages 82 - 85)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 86</p> <p>1 MR. BONSIGNORE: Yes. Mr. Alioto is entitled 2 to an opinion, but so is Mr. Scarpulla and the other 3 objectors. It was one option to hire the excluded 4 plaintiffs' reviewer. The smarter option is to have the 5 court hire their own because then it's absolutely 6 independent and it wipes out the argument oh, it's a 7 battle of the experts. That's gone. So you're 8 presented only with -- I'll summarize my -- so you're 9 presented only with someone who you hired and the 10 argument that it's a battle of the experts is entirely 11 eliminated. Thank you.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. The next issue 13 that is on my mind is this -- the impact of the Chunghwa 14 settlement. And I confess to be confused as to what the 15 objectors are really saying is the problem created for 16 this settlement by the terms of the Chunghwa settlement. 17 I forget who -- whether it was Ms. Moore who -- go 18 ahead, Mr. Cooper --</p> <p>19 MR. COOPER: I think --</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: -- or Ms. Kirkham. Either 21 one.</p> <p>22 MR. COOPER: Go ahead.</p> <p>23 MS. KIRKHAM: We didn't say that it was a 24 problem for the settlement approval. We said it was a 25 problem for the approval of the plan of allocation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 88</p> <p>1 there's \$10 million in California's pot and \$7 million 2 in Arizona's, or \$5 million or -- well, some other 3 state. Arizona is not a good, actually, example.</p> <p>4 MR. COOPER: It also includes Illinois, Oregon 5 and Washington.</p> <p>6 MS. KIRKHAM: Right, it does include Illinois, 7 but the point I'm trying to make --</p> <p>8 MR. COOPER: It generally includes 9 distributions to Illinois, Washington and Oregon who are 10 excluded --</p> <p>11 (Reporter clarification).</p> <p>12 The distribution in the judgment includes 13 payments to Illinois, Oregon and Washington AGs who are 14 not in these settlements. But there is no provision for 15 that coming out. And also that class, that settlement 16 class includes resellers of product.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: So what should we do?</p> <p>18 MR. COOPER: I think it's a problem.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>20 MR. COOPER: You have to re-notice.</p> <p>21 SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you. But what do I do 22 about it?</p> <p>23 MR. COOPER: Well, you disapprove it, is what 24 you do. You've got to re-notice people in other states. 25 You've got to carve out the money. You have to tell</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 87</p> <p>1 because the plan of allocation ignores the existence of 2 the Chunghwa settlement. And the Chunghwa settlement 3 has some very specific terms in it about how the money 4 is to be paid out and to whom. So that was what we 5 raised.</p> <p>6 We simply said that it was -- that the problem 7 was that the Chunghwa settlement, which is final, 8 provides a plan of allocation. That plan of allocation 9 is not incorporated into this plan of allocation, and 10 this plan of allocation would -- is inconsistent with 11 that plan of allocation.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: How?</p> <p>13 MS. KIRKHAM: Okay. The Chunghwa --</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: I know your brief said this but I 15 --</p> <p>16 MS. KIRKHAM: That's okay. I can go through it 17 fairly quickly.</p> <p>18 The Chunghwa allocation provides for the 19 settlement money to be divided up among certain states 20 with -- proportionate to census data. So they would -- 21 so it creates pots that are fixed amounts. Then claims 22 would be solicited. So -- as opposed to a pro rata 23 among all of the people that the plan of allocation 24 deemed entitled to receive money, which is the current 25 plan, you can see there'd be a real difference if</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 89</p> <p>1 people what's happening. I just don't -- you can't just 2 ignore it.</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I'm sorry to be 4 plodding here. But to whom do we have to give notice 5 now?</p> <p>6 MR. COOPER: Well, if the class includes 7 resellers, you have to now have a notice which says that 8 resellers can claim against this pie.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Because the Chunghwa 10 settlement includes payments, potential payments to 11 resellers --</p> <p>12 MR. COOPER: Right.</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: -- whereas this one doesn't.</p> <p>14 MS. KIRKHAM: Doesn't. And the Chunghwa notice 15 told resellers they would be paid at a later date.</p> <p>16 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So let me see if I get 17 it. You're saying there are two significant differences 18 between the allocation plan in Chunghwa and this 19 allocation plan. One is resellers get money from 20 Chunghwa. They don't here.</p> <p>21 Number two is there's a different formula for 22 distributing money state by state in Chunghwa than the 23 pro rata plan that is proposed here.</p> <p>24 MS. KIRKHAM: Yes, yes.</p> <p>25 SPECIAL MASTER: I got it.</p>

23 (Pages 86 - 89)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 90</p> <p>1 Mr. Alioto.</p> <p>2 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. There's no inconsistency.</p> <p>3 First of all, with respect to resellers, the notice</p> <p>4 that's in our brief, the notice is quite clear that</p> <p>5 because of the relatively small amount of money paid</p> <p>6 under the Chunghwa settlement, that would be the</p> <p>7 settlement for the ten million dollars plus the proffer.</p> <p>8 Because of that small amount, it would not have been</p> <p>9 practicable to actually allocate money. And the notice</p> <p>10 recites -- I'll try to find that cite in the brief, but</p> <p>11 -- it's in our most recent brief. We cite to the notice</p> <p>12 that says resellers, you may not get money. And that</p> <p>13 was put in there because of the small amount of the</p> <p>14 settlement.</p> <p>15 And so there's never been any expectation or</p> <p>16 promise that they would get money as part of that</p> <p>17 Chunghwa settlement.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: But I'm being told there was</p> <p>19 final approval of the Chunghwa settlement, and in that</p> <p>20 settlement was a provision for giving money to</p> <p>21 resellers.</p> <p>22 MR. ALIOTO: Well, I would have to see that.</p> <p>23 SPECIAL MASTER: Isn't that a final judgment?</p> <p>24 MR. ALIOTO: Well, that's -- no, I think what</p> <p>25 they're saying is in that -- they're referring to orders</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 92</p> <p>1 you're not getting any money?</p> <p>2 MR. ALIOTO: Yeah, and I'm not so sure that</p> <p>3 there is any inconsistency.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, resellers get money,</p> <p>5 resellers don't get money. That sounds like an</p> <p>6 inconsistency.</p> <p>7 MR. ALIOTO: Yeah, but what are they referring</p> <p>8 to -- I mean, I'm going on arguments that have been</p> <p>9 made. What are they -- I'm trying to respond to an</p> <p>10 argument, but I'm not exactly sure what the argument is.</p> <p>11 The argument is that there was something in the final</p> <p>12 judgment in the --</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: In the -- I am being -- wait.</p> <p>14 Okay. Mr. Scarpulla.</p> <p>15 MR. SCARPULLA: Your Honor, there was a final</p> <p>16 judgment approving the settlement with Chunghwa which</p> <p>17 provided for a payment to resellers. It's in there.</p> <p>18 It's final.</p> <p>19 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. All right.</p> <p>20 MR. SCARPULLA: Period. And then there was</p> <p>21 also a provision in there which provided that the money</p> <p>22 would be divided certain percentages by state. That's</p> <p>23 gone too.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>25 MR. ALIOTO: All right.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 91</p> <p>1 that there was a provision to give money to states.</p> <p>2 There's two issues here. One is resellers.</p> <p>3 That issue, I submit, is very straightforward. Because</p> <p>4 of the small amount, we recognized at the time that</p> <p>5 there might not be money to distribute.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, it may be a small</p> <p>7 amount, but we have the small issue of a final judgment</p> <p>8 that says they get money.</p> <p>9 MR. ALIOTO: I don't believe that's recited in</p> <p>10 the final judgment, Your Honor. It's been quite a while</p> <p>11 since I've seen that, and we'll check that. But the</p> <p>12 notice, the document that actually went to class members</p> <p>13 said you're not -- you may not get anything. That's</p> <p>14 quite clear, and that's cited in our brief. Now whether</p> <p>15 there's some -- some mention to the contrary in the</p> <p>16 judgment, I just don't know from memory, but I will</p> <p>17 check that. The notice, the crucial document that was</p> <p>18 sent to the class member that they read and relied on</p> <p>19 had that provision.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So your -- your</p> <p>21 position is that any inconsistency with respect to the</p> <p>22 treatment of resellers or other class members in</p> <p>23 Chunghwa and this case is cured by the "new</p> <p>24 comprehensive," in quotes, notice, that you gave in this</p> <p>25 case, and that notice in effect says oops, actually</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 93</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Let's be practical here. We</p> <p>2 don't want a \$10 million tail to wag the \$576 million</p> <p>3 dog. So this is a problem that I would like to find a</p> <p>4 way to cure and not have it be a reason to foul up a</p> <p>5 settlement.</p> <p>6 MR. SCARPULLA: But that's a big problem, Your</p> <p>7 Honor, because it's constitutional issues of due</p> <p>8 process.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: I get it. If it's a problem,</p> <p>10 it's a problem.</p> <p>11 MR. ALIOTO: And what that settlement provided</p> <p>12 for -- and here's -- I think I get the gist of the</p> <p>13 argument. When we sought approval of that Chunghwa</p> <p>14 settlement, certain attorneys general appeared. They</p> <p>15 got the notice, and they got the CAFA notice, and they</p> <p>16 stood up for their rights.</p> <p>17 And Washington said we want to go our own way.</p> <p>18 And Oregon and Illinois said we want to go our own way</p> <p>19 in the future, but thanks a lot for getting this</p> <p>20 settlement and we should get this money. We -- and that</p> <p>21 issue was tee'd up in front of Judge Legge. And Judge</p> <p>22 Legge ruled yes, they're entitled as AGs to that money,</p> <p>23 and the judgment and the preliminary approval order</p> <p>24 recited that. That was a ruling by Judge Legge. Not a</p> <p>25 contractual arrangement or deal, it was a -- it was a</p>

<p>1 contested matter and a ruling by the judge.</p> <p>2 I think where the confusion comes in, Your 3 Honor, is the amount of the settlement that was 4 allocated to Illinois and Oregon was based on a 5 population allocation. That population allocation is 6 set out in the order, and it says Illinois and Oregon 7 are going to get X amount based on this population 8 calculation. It was like setting forth the background 9 of the calculation.</p> <p>10 What the objectors are saying is that that 11 background of the allocation to Illinois and Oregon, 12 that meant that all those other states had to get money. 13 That's not the case. The listing of all those other 14 states was just for the purpose of showing how we 15 arrived at the allocation figure from Washington and 16 Oregon. No inconsistency. Money is going to be paid to 17 those states. Matter of fact, I just spoke with Blake 18 Harrop (phonetic) the other day, a couple of days ago 19 confirming that with him. That settlement is over, it's 20 done, and those terms are going to be honored as part of 21 this larger package.</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: What do you mean they're going 23 to be honored?</p> <p>24 MR. ALIOTO: There's a provision in the 25 Chunghwa settlement per Judge Legge's ruling that a</p>	<p>Page 94</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: But how -- if there was a 2 final approval by the district court of a settlement 3 that provided money going to resellers, how do we ignore 4 that?</p> <p>5 MR. ALIOTO: Well, I'm going to have to check 6 that final judgment, Your Honor.</p> <p>7 MR. COOPER: Well, the class includes 8 resellers, Your Honor. The settlement class includes 9 resellers.</p> <p>10 MR. ALIOTO: I will say --</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Did you have -- you're shaking 12 your head. Do you have something of wisdom to add? No? 13 All right.</p> <p>14 MR. ALIOTO: Keep in mind that this is --</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: Look, this is a small issue in 16 magnitude, but it's troubling, and I don't have any of 17 the -- I mean, they're all in the record. But nobody 18 has really thoroughly briefed this. Nobody has given me 19 a stack of material I should look at like the language 20 of the Chunghwa settlement, the -- the orders approving 21 it and so on. And there's not a lot of time between now 22 and January 15.</p> <p>23 MR. COOPER: We'll pull them together and send 24 them to you, Your Honor. We'll send the list that we're 25 going to send to Mr. Alioto in advance of sending it to</p>
<p>1 certain -- certain percentages of money must be paid to 2 the state of Illinois and the state of Oregon. And 3 those payments will be made because that was part of 4 that settlement approval.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: So you will carve out an 6 exception to the pro rata distribution to take care of 7 Oregon and Illinois?</p> <p>8 MR. ALIOTO: Precisely.</p> <p>9 MR. COOPER: And the amount of money that will 10 be distributed pro rata will be the amount of money you 11 think is involved less the amounts that go to those AGs. 12 So all the notice that says this is the amount you're 13 going to share pro rata is incorrect by the amount. It 14 may not be a large amount, but it's incorrect, and 15 there's been nowhere in all the presentations about 16 this, any acknowledgment until we brought it up of the 17 problems with what exists with regard to the commitments 18 made in connection with the Chunghwa settlement.</p> <p>19 Look at the -- look at the order of 20 preliminarily approving the Chunghwa settlement. That's 21 where the chart of states and percentages is attached.</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: What about resellers, Mr. 23 Alioto? What --</p> <p>24 MR. ALIOTO: There will be -- there's no 25 payment contemplated to the resellers, Your Honor.</p>	<p>Page 95</p> <p>1 you in case he wants to add something to the list.</p> <p>2 MS. MOORE: Just a point that I believe now 3 that everyone can make a claim, there's no place on the 4 website to actually make a claim for resellers.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: Yeah, I mean, resellers have 6 been excluded from this settlement. I understand.</p> <p>7 Yes, Mr. Bonsignore?</p> <p>8 MR. BONSIGNORE: Very briefly Your Honor, you 9 might find 55 F.3d 768, 797. It's a third circuit case 10 cert. denied, 516 U.S. 824 of interest and when you're 11 evaluating this specific issue.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: Give me the name of the case.</p> <p>13 MR. BONSIGNORE: In re General Motors Corp 14 Pickup Truck Fuel Tank Products Liability Litigation.</p> <p>15 SPECIAL MASTER: And is that cited in your 16 brief somewhere?</p> <p>17 MR. BONSIGNORE: Yes.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Thank you.</p> <p>19 Sir.</p> <p>20 MR. ST. JOHN: This strikes me as someone 21 representing a client who is potentially impacted by 22 this as an unforced error by class counsel. And I agree 23 with Your Honor that it shouldn't wag the dog. I think 24 the solution is that the party that's responsible for 25 the unforced error should pay for it. Deduct the cost</p>

25 (Pages 94 - 97)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 98</p> <p>1 from class counsel's fees.</p> <p>2 SPECIAL MASTER: Deduct what costs?</p> <p>3 MR. ST. JOHN: Whatever additional notice and</p> <p>4 whatever it costs to fix payments for resellers and</p> <p>5 payments to the states in question. Mr. Alioto made the</p> <p>6 mistake. There's a term for that, but Mr. Alioto should</p> <p>7 be responsible for fixing it. And you can fix it</p> <p>8 without -- and resolve these problems.</p> <p>9 MR. ALIOTO: We'll determine that when Your</p> <p>10 Honor has the full records and you can make that</p> <p>11 determination.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. Before we leave,</p> <p>13 I'll set up an additional briefing schedule on this</p> <p>14 issue.</p> <p>15 Now, that brings us to Mr. Varanini. And you</p> <p>16 want to extend the claim deadline?</p> <p>17 MR. VARANINI: Yes. But --</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: And I am told by your</p> <p>19 colleagues on the other side that doing so will create</p> <p>20 all sorts of claims of disparate treatment. California</p> <p>21 residents will be claimed to be given a longer time to</p> <p>22 make claims than other people and so on. Before you get</p> <p>23 into your argument, let me ask you: What happens if the</p> <p>24 court says no? What happens down in the California</p> <p>25 state court if the court says no, we're not going to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 100</p> <p>1 sort of the residue that can help those folks who don't</p> <p>2 file claims as far as injunctive relief. And so we</p> <p>3 agreed if we can persuade defendants to insert language</p> <p>4 that would make it crystal clear, even though this has</p> <p>5 always been our position, that we were not out there to</p> <p>6 supplant or replace class claims.</p> <p>7 There's a price for that. Because we can't</p> <p>8 give defendants exclusivity. We can't say okay, we can</p> <p>9 give you a release which would eliminate Mr. Alioto's</p> <p>10 claim 'cause we don't do that. They're not going to pay</p> <p>11 us a lot of money because Mr. Alioto is the one who can</p> <p>12 come in there and say I've got these big claims.</p> <p>13 They're worth a lot of money. This is -- this is what I</p> <p>14 bring to the table.</p> <p>15 So we didn't negotiate for the kinds of sums of</p> <p>16 money that would allow us to run a direct recovery</p> <p>17 program where people could make claims against our pot,</p> <p>18 even leaving aside the other claims that we have in our</p> <p>19 case, because we do have other claims aside from natural</p> <p>20 people. So that's what we relied on.</p> <p>21 Traditionally the way we work is we come in at</p> <p>22 the allocation stage, like we have here. Usually this</p> <p>23 is behind the scenes because we have joint settlements.</p> <p>24 Here it's not behind the scenes, so this makes it</p> <p>25 different. But we come in, and we give advice on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 99</p> <p>1 extend the deadline? Sorry, deadline is a deadline.</p> <p>2 MR. VARANINI: Well then --</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: What do you do practically?</p> <p>4 MR. VARANINI: Practically that's a difficult</p> <p>5 question because we have to figure out what to tell</p> <p>6 California and actual people.</p> <p>7 SPECIAL MASTER: They now have settled or --</p> <p>8 their parens patriae --</p> <p>9 MR. VARANINI: Yes.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: -- their claims that you</p> <p>11 brought on their behalf. Where do they make claims?</p> <p>12 MR. VARANINI: Well, they can't. We didn't --</p> <p>13 this is set out in our briefing, so if Your Honor</p> <p>14 doesn't mind my summarizing the briefing, that's fine,</p> <p>15 but I would encourage Your Honor to look at it.</p> <p>16 When we settled these cases, we did so based on</p> <p>17 having had discussions with the indirect purchaser</p> <p>18 plaintiffs trying to fix a situation that occurred</p> <p>19 within early settlement. And as part of that, the</p> <p>20 amounts that we negotiated for were done with the view</p> <p>21 that the indirect purchaser plaintiffs were out there.</p> <p>22 They were in federal court. They were ahead of us going</p> <p>23 to trial.</p> <p>24 Traditionally, you know, private plaintiffs are</p> <p>25 good at getting monetary relief, and we tend to focus on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 101</p> <p>1 allocation. We say okay, we as AGs really care about</p> <p>2 natural people. Not to say private plaintiffs don't,</p> <p>3 but we really care about them. They're our citizens,</p> <p>4 they're going to complain to us if there's a problem.</p> <p>5 They're not going to go complain to you.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Might even vote you out of</p> <p>7 office.</p> <p>8 MR. VARANINI: Right. They might vote her out</p> <p>9 of office or hypothetically they might decide not to</p> <p>10 promote her to the next office that's coming up. So we</p> <p>11 take --</p> <p>12 MR. GOLDBERG: We have that on the record.</p> <p>13 MR. VARANINI: I'm aware of that. I hope the</p> <p>14 general looks favorably on me for having said it. But</p> <p>15 be that as it may, we're the ones who are going to get</p> <p>16 the criticism. So when we send out a notice that would</p> <p>17 say -- and we can't because we don't agree with it --</p> <p>18 that would say California natural people, you can't file</p> <p>19 claims. You're going to have to live with what we can</p> <p>20 give you on cy pres, meaning sort of this indirect</p> <p>21 relief where we give money for the indirect benefit of</p> <p>22 the class. Just making sure there's a complete record.</p> <p>23 I know Your Honor is very well aware of this. We're the</p> <p>24 ones who are going to get criticized. And this is -- we</p> <p>25 negotiate these settlements in reliance on this</p>

26 (Pages 98 - 101)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 102</p> <p>1 understanding that we tried to implement to move 2 forward.</p> <p>3 SPECIAL MASTER: But let me just --</p> <p>4 MR. VARANINI: Sure.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: All the natural people in 6 California whom you represent have already gotten the 7 federal notices.</p> <p>8 MR. VARANINI: Correct.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: They've already had an 10 opportunity up until December 7 to submit claims. 11 You're kind of saying they should -- because we have a 12 parens patriae claim on their behalf, they should get a 13 second whack at the Apple?</p> <p>14 MR. VARANINI: Not exactly, Your Honor. We're 15 saying one of two things here. Okay? This shades into 16 the other issues. So we believe that for allocation 17 purposes, for allocation purposes from what we can see 18 from the face of what was done, because that's all we 19 have -- we don't have access to the notice and claims 20 data -- so what we can see from the face of things is we 21 believe there are deficiencies where natural people 22 didn't get their fair shot.</p> <p>23 In the context of allocation there is notice. 24 Notice as you've heard these gentlemen and lady talking 25 about have to do with reach, right? How many eyeballs</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 104</p> <p>1 the court? 2 It puts us in a really sticky situation. So 3 one of -- we proposed one of two paths. Either -- you 4 know, either reform the claims process as part of the 5 allocation plan, which Mr. Alioto has referred to he may 6 be open to, or extend the claims deadline so that we can 7 tell California natural persons they have an opportunity 8 to claim.</p> <p>9 Now one final point. We have said that Your 10 Honor, even on that point, extending the claims 11 deadline, that Your Honor has a choice. You can do that 12 as to California natural people only because we and we 13 alone of all the groups of claimants have this parens 14 claim that's out there for them. And that is unique, 15 and that is something that the court can use to make a 16 difference. And we've given Your Honor cases and 17 argument on that. Or Your Honor can extend it as to 18 everybody.</p> <p>19 And on that point, Mr. Alioto has expressed his 20 fears about corporations being unfairly advantaged as 21 part of that. We responded to that. We believe there's 22 no evidence to back that up. But more importantly, we 23 believe there's a couple of constructive solutions that 24 Your Honor can recommend to deal with that if Your Honor 25 feels it's more appropriate to extend the claims</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 103</p> <p>1 literally saw the advertisement. That's important for 2 opt-out purposes. It's important for due process 3 purposes. But that's different than generating claims 4 to make sure that, for example, natural people had their 5 fair shot. Based on the face of what we're seeing, we 6 don't believe for reasons that we've already said in our 7 brief that natural people had their fair shot.</p> <p>8 Now we asked for notice and claims data to give 9 a more refined -- more refined analysis for the benefit 10 of Your Honor. And that was ultimately denied, as Your 11 Honor is well aware. And it's now pending in front of 12 Your Honor. So absent that, all we have to go on is 13 what's on the face of it, and we believe that's 14 insufficient.</p> <p>15 So how this plays in the state court because 16 Your Honor asked. This is in the papers, so I apologize 17 for repeating it. But how it plays in state court is we 18 can't put in a notice that we think California natural 19 people already had their opportunity to claim and that's 20 it because we don't believe it. So -- but on the other 21 hand, the claim's deadline has closed, so do we tell 22 people: Well, go ahead and file a claim and maybe it 23 will be honored and maybe it won't? Do I tell people 24 well, the special master has recommended against it, so 25 you could file it, but we plan to make an objection to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 105</p> <p>1 deadline as to everyone.</p> <p>2 SPECIAL MASTER: So Mr. Alioto, why isn't an 3 easy solution to do what Mr. Varanini says? California 4 natural persons are special because they're the only 5 ones for whom a parens claim was brought. They need to 6 be given a fair opportunity to file claims under the 7 parens lawsuit, extend the deadline for California 8 natural people. And if anybody -- if anybody objects to 9 it as being improper disparate treatment, we say sorry, 10 they're the only ones who have a parens claim. Done, 11 easy, fix. Right? Wrong?</p> <p>12 MR. ALIOTO: Mr. Paul Novak has been working 13 with the AG. He'll respond.</p> <p>14 MR. NOVAK: Over here. Paul Novak of the 15 Milberg firm.</p> <p>16 Let me first identify a couple of points in Mr. 17 Varanini's presentation and his papers that I think we 18 agree with. The first is I think he is accurate in 19 distinguishing the posture of California natural 20 claimants vis-à-vis other class claimants in that they 21 are the only ones with the companion parens patriae suit 22 that has also been pending and litigated, albeit in the 23 separate form at the same time. We recognize that 24 distinction.</p> <p>25 He also is accurate that the district court</p>

27 (Pages 102 - 105)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 possesses equitable discretion to extend claim deadlines 2 generally. We don't contest that. We don't believe it 3 is necessary given the adequacy in our view of the 4 notice that has been implemented to California claimants 5 that a -- that a deadline extension is necessary, or 6 that an extension of that deadline would be necessary 7 for purposes of issuing final approval of our 8 settlement. But we recognize the sensitivities that are 9 associated with the parens case pending at the same 10 time. And if that's the solution that the court 11 imposes, so be it based upon that distinguished posture.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: But what's the downside?</p> <p>13 MR. NOVAK: Our primary concern is the exposure 14 to the types of objections that might come from other -- 15 from other corners or other angles. But aside from -- 16 that's our primary concern, and -- and if the court 17 doesn't find that concern to be one that's particularly 18 persuasive, I don't -- I don't think we otherwise have 19 an issue with it.</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I mean, I was contacted 21 by an enterprising aggregator directly on the afternoon 22 of December 6th asking me to do something to facilitate 23 his ability to file claims. And -- you know, so I'm 24 aware that there is that -- you know, there is that 25 industry out there which -- but...</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 with the projection, which in other cases that's been 2 provided.</p> <p>3 But let's assume for the sake of argument, 4 because I'm not trying to evade the question, that 5 that's what is going to happen; that at the end of the 6 day, leaving aside this issue of giving people treble 7 payment, let's say based on single damages just for the 8 sake of the argument for a moment. So that's the idea 9 that people at the maximum, if they filed the claim, 10 they're only going to get back their single damages.</p> <p>11 And let's assume that exhausts the fund 12 entirely. Well, if it's single damages, that's okay 13 because there is a preference for direct distribution. 14 So if you have a fund, and assuming Your Honor is 15 otherwise okay with the allocation plan, and, you know, 16 the money that was set aside for people to file claims, 17 both people and corporations, you give them single 18 damages, the money is completely run out, there isn't a 19 cent left -- and this includes issues with people having 20 moved; you can't give them checks. This includes trying 21 to track people down and you don't succeed. Let's just 22 assume for the sake of argument there isn't even that 23 ghost of a residue left.</p> <p>24 Agreed -- I would agree based on federal law 25 without respect to California law, I would agree cy pres</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 I don't know. I'm feeling as if I'm not 2 hearing any serious downside to extending the deadline 3 -- recommending to Judge Tigar that he extend the 4 deadline for California natural persons except that you 5 might get a lot of objections from people that, you 6 know, I think we could deal with. I don't want to do 7 anything that has unfortunate consequences, you know, 8 unforeseen consequences, so -- but I'm not hearing any 9 except the objections that might come in.</p> <p>10 MR. NOVAK: I -- I think that's probably an 11 accurate characterization.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Varanini, as long 13 as you're on a roll here, what -- you had some other 14 issues. You raised the issue of cy pres. You said 15 there's no cy pres provision in the -- in this 16 settlement.</p> <p>17 MR. VARANINI: Correct.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: The contemplation is 19 everything would be distributed pro rata, but how does 20 that disadvantage your California natural people?</p> <p>21 MR. VARANINI: Well, there are two parts to 22 that. One is we don't know if it's -- we don't have 23 anything in the record that says that it's all going to 24 be distributed. We have statements being made in 25 briefing, but we don't actually have the claims data</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 is not an issue. Okay? But then -- and again, we're 2 only looking at the face of the notice plan and the 3 allocation plan because we don't have the data. Data 4 would allow us to give a more refined perspective than 5 we can give. Here we're talking treble damages. Okay? 6 So this is the idea that corporations and individuals 7 not only should get the full value of their claims, but 8 that that should be trebled.</p> <p>9 And so the question that's in front of Your 10 Honor, again in the absence of additional data, is it is 11 appropriate for those folks to get three times the value 12 of their claim or is that a windfall. And if it's a 13 windfall, should that extra money go cy pres or should 14 there be at least notice to try to find additional 15 claimants first.</p> <p>16 We've proposed both as potential alternatives 17 for the court. So we said well, we think based on other 18 cases there's sort of obvious additional notice that 19 could be done to gin up claims. And because we don't 20 have the data, we don't know whether those obvious 21 additional notice that was done in other cases could be 22 done here or not.</p> <p>23 All we can do is point to the other cases, and 24 then Your Honor has to make whatever decision Your Honor 25 feels is appropriate. Or we said -- let's say it did</p>

28 (Pages 106 - 109)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 not turn out to be the case, that the indirect purchaser 2 plaintiffs come back and say look, this really would 3 cost us way too much money, and it's just not going to 4 gin up claims, okay? Well, then we said well, wait a 5 minute, then if there is this windfall, why not leave 6 some money left over for cy pres after everybody gets 7 the value of their claims in full. Then that way we 8 know everyone in the classes of the different state 9 specific damage classes gets some sort of benefit. It 10 may be indirect, but they're going to get a benefit.</p> <p>11 And as long as everyone follows the proper 12 protocol that's been set out in Ninth Circuit cases, a 13 protocol we're very experienced with, there shouldn't be 14 the kinds of issues that have arisen in other cases such 15 as Kellogg, the Ninth Circuit case. So that's why we 16 thought there's this sort of interplay between claims 17 and cy pres.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>19 MR. NOVAK: May I respond to that? Again, Mr. 20 Novak on behalf of the IPPs.</p> <p>21 Let me make a couple observations with respect 22 to the plan of allocation, its relationship to notice, 23 and the issue of single versus treble damages.</p> <p>24 First, as has already been discussed, the 25 adequacy of the notice plan has already been touched</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 cases where treble damages as the cap was acceptable to 2 the court for purposes of issuing final approval, but 3 also even to the California attorney general for 4 purposes of obtaining final approval on some of those 5 settlements.</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: In LCD there was a treble 7 damage cap.</p> <p>8 MR. NOVAK: LCD had a treble damage cap.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Did the California attorney 10 general complain about that there?</p> <p>11 MR. VARANINI: No, we did not.</p> <p>12 SPECIAL MASTER: Of course, there was more 13 money.</p> <p>14 MR. VARANINI: Well, if -- if I may, aside from 15 the issue of whether there was more money or not, and we 16 were working with other states and so had to compromise, 17 there were two key distinguishing factors about LCDs, at 18 least we thought. Now Your Honor may disagree with 19 that. One of those -- one of the distinguishing factors 20 was there was a more extensive notice campaign done for 21 purposes of ginning up claims than is being done here.</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: Right.</p> <p>23 MR. VARANINI: The second distinguishing 24 factors are the amount of the fees claims were lower, so 25 there was more money in the pot.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 upon. I think even the California attorney general 2 recognizes that the notice plan as implemented meets the 3 due process requirements and Rule 23 requirements. 4 Exhibit C of his declaration, the claim stimulation 5 document that references the notice plan, states, quote: 6 "Due process notice programs must adhere 7 to the requirements of Rule 23 claim 8 stimulation programs. Unshackled from these 9 requirements allow us to think outside the 10 box."</p> <p>11 So what Mr. Varanini is discussing is something 12 that exceeds the requirements that class counsel has for 13 purposes of creating and submitting and implementing the 14 notice plan that then informs the claims administration 15 process.</p> <p>16 As it relates to claims administration, 17 although we don't have final data, and in the event that 18 the court extends the deadline for the submission of 19 claims, won't have the deadline -- won't have the data 20 for an even greater period of time, but what we think is 21 going to happen with -- based simply upon the claims 22 that have been submitted to date is that claimants are 23 going to receive much closer to single damages than they 24 will to treble damages.</p> <p>25 And we note that there are a number of other</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Not a lot.</p> <p>2 MR. VARANINI: Not a lot. And there was -- in 3 LCDs there was a reversionary -- there was -- sorry, 4 reversionary is the wrong term. There was a clause that 5 said if there was any money left over, it would go to 6 our cy pres. So there were distinguishing features of 7 LCDs that we could say well, maybe -- look, in a perfect 8 world -- you get the point.</p> <p>9 SPECIAL MASTER: Fair enough. Go ahead.</p> <p>10 (Electronic interruption.)</p> <p>11 MR. NOVAK: The other point I wanted to make, 12 and this is with respect to at what point does a court 13 make a determination. We've given enough money to 14 claimants. Let's proceed to distribute the remaining 15 money on a cy pres basis.</p> <p>16 I brought to Mr. Varanini's attention this 17 morning when we were discussing these issues that some 18 of the other circuits -- the Ninth Circuit hasn't spoken 19 on this issue or, for that matter, any court in the 20 Ninth Circuit that I'm aware of. Other circuits have 21 addressed the issue of at what point do you go to cy 22 pres.</p> <p>23 And in the Second Circuit, specifically in the 24 Masters versus Wilhelmina modelling case, it's 473 F.3d 25 423. The second circuit actually found it to be an</p>

29 (Pages 110 - 113)

Veritext Legal Solutions

www.veritext.com

212-267-6868

516-608-2400

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 abuse of discretion to consider cy pres distribution 2 before making a treble damage allocation to the 3 claimants. 4 And I think a couple of other courts have come 5 to a similar conclusion, although not probably as 6 clearly as the Masters decision. One is a Bank America 7 decision 775 F.3d 1060. I'm not going to suggest that 8 it went as far as Masters versus Wilhelmina, but it 9 cited language from that decision on the cy pres issue 10 and the treble damages issue approvingly. That's from 11 the Eighth Circuit. There's also an in re publication 12 paper -- 13 SPECIAL MASTER: You know what, I'm going to 14 ask you to do the same. 15 MR. NOVAK: I'll submit -- 16 SPECIAL MASTER: If you could just submit a 17 letter with any citations you wanted. 18 MR. NOVAK: Okay. Particularly that one 19 because I've only got a Lexis cite for it, and you'll 20 need it in Westlaw. 21 SPECIAL MASTER: All right. 22 MR. NOVAK: So other courts that have looked at 23 that issue have explicitly found that it's okay to go up 24 to a full treble damage, and in some instances have said 25 it was an abuse of discretion not to go first to treble</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 appropriate. 2 And let me make one final observation. And 3 that is that this whole idea that we need to go until 4 the very end of the claims distribution process when all 5 of this data has been submitted and make the 6 determination based on that, if we continue to extend 7 the claims deadline, it has the problem of continually 8 forestalling the distribution of money to claimants, 9 which given the amount of time between the beginning of 10 the class period -- oh, that actually reminds me of one 11 other thing. 12 And that is there -- if you had actually 13 obtained these damages back when these purchases were 14 initially made at the beginning of the damage period, 15 and didn't have the time value of that money for what's 16 near 20 years, that makes treble damages all the more 17 appropriate, even though I don't think any claimants are 18 going to be getting it based on the claims data that's 19 been submitted. 20 SPECIAL MASTER: You're worried that people may 21 have been eight years old when the claim period started, 22 but they may be 80 before they get any money. 23 Mr. Varanini, I'm worried about your practical 24 problem here. Let's say I recommend next week that the 25 claim deadline be extended. Nothing is going to happen</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 damages. The Lupron marketing decision that Mr. 2 Varanini pointed to actually had a 1.67 multiple of 3 damages for claimants as -- as the cut off in that 4 settlement, and it was a cut off that had been 5 negotiated. 6 What happened in that case is plaintiffs 7 originally had a 100 percent allocation plan. You had 8 some objectors come in and say hey, we should receive 9 more than 100 percent before cy pres distributions are 10 made. And so a negotiation to revise the settlement to 11 increase it to 1.67 times was made. 12 And then at that point, the court said because 13 the objectors settled with that revision to the 14 settlement and then came back later and argued about it, 15 and the court said you've -- you've waived your 16 arguments with respect to getting even more than 1.67 17 times your damages because you obtained consideration 18 for it when you revised the settlement agreement. 19 So basically I think the case law certainly 20 allows for distributions to go up to treble damages, if 21 not require it, particularly in an instance where as 22 here it's not contested that the notice plan meets due 23 process and Rule 23 requirements for being the best 24 practicable notice. And for those reasons we don't 25 think that the modifications to the allocation plan are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 on that until March 15 unless I ask Judge Tigar to rule 2 separately on that issue quickly. 3 MR. VARANINI: Well, there are -- sorry. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: And you've got a January 27 5 hearing. 6 MR. VARANINI: Yes. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: And you've got to give notice. 8 MR. VARANINI: Yes. There are three responses 9 to that. First of all, if nothing else, we could at 10 least say that Your Honor has in your report and 11 recommendation recommended the extension of claims 12 deadline. That would be positive encouragement that we 13 could point out to people to submit claims, even if 14 ultimately the court retains the discretion to say no, 15 and we would have to say something about that to be 16 frank. 17 The second point is that as Your Honor 18 indicated, Your Honor could recommend to Judge Tigar to 19 rule quickly on this one issue so we would have an 20 answer before the hearing. 21 The third possibility is that we do have 22 pursuant to the proposal we had made to extend the 23 claims deadline, we've left some water in there. So if 24 something happened, we could -- we could, for example, 25 move the hearing back by a week or two and still have</p>

30 (Pages 114 - 117)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 more than enough time for people to get notice and still 2 not leave things out of sync with the final approval 3 hearing.</p> <p>4 At some point we do recognize that if things 5 get pushed back far enough, that's on us. So we want to 6 have the preliminary approval hearing very soon, and we 7 prefer to have it on the date that we set, but we did 8 leave a little bit of water in our proposal to move it 9 forward to June 30th so that we would have the ability 10 to deal with these kinds of circumstances.</p> <p>11 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So I've covered my 12 agenda. Is there anyone who has anything remaining that 13 they think should be brought to my attention?</p> <p>14 Mr. Cooper.</p> <p>15 MR. COOPER: This doesn't actually have to do 16 with any of the substance we've been talking about. One 17 of my questions relates to the protocols for getting 18 notices and distributions. You posted yesterday an 19 email exchange that apparently you had with Mr. Alioto, 20 and I'm not certain with Mr. Scarpulla or not, which set 21 out the issues you wanted to talk about today. The 22 original emails and your email responding were not sent 23 to all counsel, and so --</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: My bad.</p> <p>25 MR. COOPER: Well, apparently Mr. Alioto's --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 that someone would just have to call me on the phone. I 2 would really like to avoid that, but, you know, if 3 circumstances demand it, my Order of Reference permits 4 it.</p> <p>5 MR. COOPER: I was aware of what it says in the 6 Order of Reference about ex parte communications, 7 although I do believe the word was "scheduling" and not 8 "procedural" but I'm not quibbling -- I'm not quibbling 9 about that. But this particular email seemed not to be 10 in that category where you've talked substantively about 11 what's going to happen, and that's why I'm bringing it 12 up, so...</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: I've already apologized. I 14 don't know what more I can do.</p> <p>15 MR. COOPER: I'm not trying to beat it up 16 anymore.</p> <p>17 My second question was during the discussion 18 you were having with regard to notice and claims in the 19 discussions, particularly about the claims rates and 20 what the experience has been, you made a statement, and 21 I wrote the words down, and I believe it's a question to 22 Mr. Alioto with regard to the information about the 23 claims experiences. And you said: Would that be the 24 end of the, quote, "final" -- or when, quote, "the final 25 papers are filed."</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: I apologize.</p> <p>2 MR. COOPER: -- directly going to you initially 3 was not sent over yesterday. So my question is what are 4 the protocols so we can all be getting timely notice of 5 what's going on?</p> <p>6 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. The Order of Reference 7 allows me to have ex parte conversations with counsel on 8 procedural issues. I keep it -- try to keep it to a 9 minimum. At the very beginning when we were getting 10 organized, Mr. Alioto and I talked quite a bit as we've 11 gotten into this. I've tried to keep it more formal and 12 more transparent.</p> <p>13 So I think that from now on any email exchange 14 with me, either email or letter exchange with me should 15 be posted on Case Anywhere on the JAMS website, and I 16 failed to do that. I was actually on vacation, and 17 that's just my mistake.</p> <p>18 And -- I mean I think I sent it to the people I 19 thought would have the most interest in it, Mr. Varanini 20 and Mr. Scarpulla and Mr. Alioto. So I apologize to 21 everyone else. But I think that's the way we should do 22 it. Any communications with me should be -- should be 23 posted on the Case Anywhere.</p> <p>24 You know, I suppose something could come up 25 that would be incredibly urgent, a procedural matter</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 And that confused me because I thought that the 2 only papers that are yet to be filed is your report and 3 objections and responses to that, and I didn't know what 4 you were referring to by final papers.</p> <p>5 SPECIAL MASTER: I don't either. But I take it 6 what would normally happen is that there'd be an ongoing 7 reporting to the court of the progress of the claim 8 process to allow the court to confirm that the claim 9 process was being carried out the way it was supposed to 10 be carried out. So...</p> <p>11 MR. COOPER: Well, I just wasn't certain if 12 there was some briefing schedule that I wasn't aware of.</p> <p>13 SPECIAL MASTER: No, no.</p> <p>14 All right. Anything else? I have a couple of 15 things to say at the end, but --</p> <p>16 MR. ALIOTO: Two points, Your Honor.</p> <p>17 SPECIAL MASTER: Mr. St. John.</p> <p>18 MR. ST. JOHN: Your Honor, do you want any 19 argument on the issues raised in IPP counsel's surreply?</p> <p>20 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, what are you referring 21 to?</p> <p>22 MR. ST. JOHN: The judicial estoppel vis-à-vis 23 Chunghwa and the Philips and Samsung settlements.</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: The point on Philips and 25 Samsung I think that you made was they're so big there</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 122</p> <p>1 must be something out of whack. 2 MR. ST. JOHN: Correct, Your Honor. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: The others must be too small. 4 Words to that effect. 5 MR. ST. JOHN: More than the size is 6 attributable to factors other than class counsel's 7 efforts such that they're not properly -- that the 8 entirety of those settlements are not properly 9 includable in the fee base. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: I think I have your arguments 11 on that. I mean -- I mean I may not totally remember 12 them now, but I remember reading them and understanding 13 them when I read them. 14 MR. ST. JOHN: Fair enough, Your Honor. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: Did I see other hands? Mr. -- 16 MR. SCARPULLA: I just have a quick question, 17 Your Honor. To the extent that Your Honor is going to 18 have a hearing on fees, will you let us know that or if 19 you're not -- 20 SPECIAL MASTER: No, it will be held secretly. 21 No. 22 You mean a hearing on the allocation of fees, 23 or the hearing on the total amount of fees? 24 MR. SCARPULLA: Well -- 25 SPECIAL MASTER: Oh, I see what you're</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 124</p> <p>1 want to briefly address, if now is the time, arguments 2 made in surreply about Chunghwa and judicial estoppel. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Sure. 4 MR. ST. JOHN: Class counsel is playing fast 5 and loose with the idea that small -- small settlement, 6 their words, was invaluable and an icebreaker. And 7 there's no dispute that those words were represented to 8 the court, and there's still no dispute that Chunghwa's 9 assistance was invaluable. That's at page 13 of the 10 surreply. 11 What they try to do is limit that value in the 12 early stage of litigation. But class counsel disposed 13 of the class claims for again a small settlement and 14 made those representations, and the fact that it causes 15 litigation regrets, that's precisely what judicial 16 estoppel targets. 17 Class counsel argues or they try to minimize 18 the value of the Chunghwa settlement by emphasizing that 19 DOJ only prosecuted one corporate defendant. I don't 20 think that's particularly uncommon. The DOJ has limited 21 resources. They prosecute a small number of defendants 22 to bust the settlement -- or bust the conspiracy and 23 then leave the rest to private litigants. That's 24 precisely what DOJ did here. 25 SPECIAL MASTER: What is -- your point about</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 123</p> <p>1 saying -- no. What I said in that email was that I 2 wanted to focus this hearing on the issues that we've 3 already talked about. 4 MR. SCARPULLA: Correct. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: I am not excluding -- you may 6 say anything you want to about fees now. I mean I think 7 I understand all the arguments you've made. I have them 8 in mind, and we'll consider them. If there's anything 9 more anybody wants to say about the fee request or the 10 expense request, you may do so. If you were sandbagged 11 and thought that wasn't going to come up today, you 12 know, I'm -- I'm -- I don't know what to say. I don't 13 have time to set another oral argument. But you're free 14 to say anything you want now. 15 MR. SCARPULLA: Well, I think it's all in the 16 briefs, and I wasn't -- but I wasn't sure whether Your 17 Honor was going to have that as a separate hearing from 18 this one. 19 SPECIAL MASTER: No. I think what I said was I 20 think I have enough in the briefing and in the 21 declarations from the various attorneys and so on and so 22 on to make hopefully an intelligent ruling on that. 23 MR. SCARPULLA: Right. 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Sir. 25 MR. ST. JOHN: Your Honor, I apologize. I do</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 125</p> <p>1 the Chunghwa settlement is what? 2 MR. ST. JOHN: The Chunghwa settlement created 3 a lot of value beyond its \$10 million. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 5 MR. ST. JOHN: And that value is not really 6 attributable to class counsel. 7 SPECIAL MASTER: So we should reduce the fee 8 request to reflect that? 9 MR. ST. JOHN: Correct, Your Honor. 10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 11 MR. ST. JOHN: It's the first stage of the 12 rocket. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 14 MR. ALIOTO: Two final points, Your Honor, and 15 I'll be very brief. 16 One, there was a statement earlier about 17 further notice to an additional group. There's nothing 18 in the papers about this. I want to just make sure this 19 is focused up. 20 After the formal notice program, our claim 21 administrator was able to get an email list of claimants 22 in the DRAM case, people who had actually made claims in 23 the DRAM case. And our claims administrator arranged 24 for direct email notice to be sent to those claimants. 25 It was a supplement to the notice. It wasn't something</p>

32 (Pages 122 - 125)

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 126</p> <p>1 we did because we were having a problem or having 2 trouble. We did it as a supplement to the notice to 3 spur claims. And you can imagine that was effective 4 because these are people who had claimed before, and 5 they were -- they would be motivated to claim again. 6 The other argument I want to make and just a 7 sentence or two is we have made in our papers a standing 8 argument with respect to Mr. Scarpulla and Cooper. 9 There's nothing been said about that in these 10 proceedings. We have no intention of waiving that. We 11 think it's a very important issue that counsel should 12 not be able to come in and make all kinds of claims in 13 settlement approval hearings. 14 They certainly have the right to do that under 15 Rule 23, but the crucial point is you have to have a 16 client. You can't just come in off the street or on a 17 volunteer basis or on an intermeddler basis and make 18 these arguments because these have consequences for us. 19 We're going to be briefing these questions. We 20 may have appeals. It's a very time-consuming, expensive 21 process, and you have to meet that threshold requirement 22 of representing a client. The cases are clear on that. 23 And the cases cited by the objectors do not provide any 24 support for these objections on behalf of indirect 25 purchasers. There's absolutely no basis for doing so.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 128</p> <p>1 MR. SCARPULLA: That is correct. 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. But in bringing these 3 objections that you both have made, you are not bringing 4 them on behalf of your clients, you are bringing them in 5 your capacity as class counsel in furtherance of your 6 fiduciary duties, correct? 7 MR. SCARPULLA: I think Mr. Cooper is bringing 8 it on behalf of his clients. 9 MR. COOPER: No, I think that's a fair 10 statement from me. 11 MS. CAPURRO: That's not what their papers said 12 when they filed their objection. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, their papers -- 14 MS. CAPURRO: None of their papers have said 15 that today. 16 SPECIAL MASTER: No, none of their papers name 17 a client on whose behalf they're bringing the objection. 18 As I understand it, they are bringing it in their 19 capacity as class counsel, not on behalf of a client. 20 And that is your standing. 21 MR. ALIOTO: We would just ask you to look at 22 the authorities on that, Your Honor. We think it's an 23 important point -- 24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 25 MR. ALIOTO: -- and that we'd like you to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 127</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. 2 MR. ALIOTO: Thank you. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Glad you brought that up. Mr. 4 -- just start with Mr. Cooper because you're closest. 5 As I understand the papers, you and your firm 6 currently represent a named or formerly named class 7 representative, correct? 8 MR. COOPER: That is correct, Your Honor, but I 9 believe in addition we are counsel of record for the 10 entire class. 11 SPECIAL MASTER: I know. One question at a 12 time. Okay? So you actually may represent a named 13 member of the class? 14 MR. COOPER: We do. 15 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Scarpulla, you did 16 represent a named class representative when you were 17 with the Zelle firm. What is your status now? 18 MR. SCARPULLA: As part of my agreement leaving 19 Zelle, I was made a -- another lawyer of record for 20 those -- for that client. However, I was told by Zelle 21 that the client does not -- does not approve of my 22 objections. 23 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. So -- but officially 24 you are still counsel of record for a client in this 25 case?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 129</p> <p>1 consider. 2 SPECIAL MASTER: Ms. Capurro. 3 MS. CAPURRO: If I may just briefly, I have 4 look extensively at the law on this, and I can find 5 absolutely no case that permits counsel in a case who 6 are not court appointed class counsel. The cases that 7 they cite in their brief -- and they're not court 8 appointed class counsel to bring an objection to a class 9 action settlement and oppose the position of the court 10 appointed class counsel. 11 SPECIAL MASTER: Why are they not court 12 appointed class counsel the same as all the other 13 lawyers in the -- 14 MS. CAPURRO: Mr. Alioto was the only court 15 appointed class counsel. All of the case law that they 16 cite in their brief, those cases when they refer to 17 class counsel, they refer to the court appointed class 18 counsel. If you have a situation where every -- every 19 lawyer in an MDL case, which is potentially hundreds of 20 lawyers, is able to speak on behalf of the entire class, 21 I mean if you take that to its logical conclusion, how 22 do you run the case? 23 I mean Mr. Alioto would be saying one thing, 24 and they can pipe up and say something else. How do the 25 defendants know who to deal with? How does the court</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 130</p> <p>1 know who to deal with? What's the point of even having 2 an order appointing lead counsel if they're able to do 3 that?</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: Well --</p> <p>5 MS. CAPURRO: And this is not a procedural 6 issue, Your Honor, this is jurisdictional. And the fact 7 that they have filed this motion to be appointed as 8 co-lead counsel actually shows that they recognize they 9 have a standing problem. That's -- they're trying to 10 bootstrap themselves in here to get the court's nod to 11 give them the voice, you know, to be able to speak on 12 behalf of these objecting plaintiffs who they've never 13 identified.</p> <p>14 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, you know, I'm -- I'm 15 cognizant also the court has an independent fiduciary 16 duty to protect the interest of the class. And if 17 information is brought to the court from any source, I 18 sort of think the court has an obligation to consider 19 it. But I -- I need to look at the authorities you've 20 cited with care.</p> <p>21 MS. CAPURRO: I submit there is no law, and 22 they have cited to none, and it is their burden to show 23 standing. They have not cited to one case --</p> <p>24 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay.</p> <p>25 MS. CAPURRO: -- that gives them standing.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 132</p> <p>1 is before it regardless of standing.</p> <p>2 MS. CAPURRO: We're not disputing that. That's 3 not the argument.</p> <p>4 SPECIAL MASTER: I think I understand the 5 argument.</p> <p>6 MR. COOPER: You have briefing on all of this, 7 Your Honor.</p> <p>8 SPECIAL MASTER: I do. I do.</p> <p>9 MR. SCARBOROUGH: Your Honor, if we're down to 10 sort of parting remarks here, I just want to say from 11 the defendants' perspective, you know, we have put a 12 tremendous pot of money into escrow. As I think lead 13 counsel pointed out may be the second largest indirect 14 purchaser settlement ever. So a tremendous amount of 15 money that they have already paid, it's already sitting 16 in escrow and has been for some time.</p> <p>17 That money was put there to buy global peace 18 for this litigation for IPP claims with the same factual 19 predicate. So that's what we want. That's what LG 20 already got. They already paid a considerably smaller 21 amount of money for the exact same release that we are 22 asking for here. So what we would like to see is at 23 least to get past that first threshold, that the money 24 that was paid, this extraordinarily large amount of 25 money that was paid is sufficient for the global</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 131</p> <p>1 SPECIAL MASTER: I get it.</p> <p>2 Is there -- Ms. Kirkham. You have your hand 3 up. Ms. Kirkham.</p> <p>4 MS. KIRKHAM: Okay. I know I'm pointing out 5 the obvious, but if there was one lead counsel and all 6 other counsel are silenced by that appointment, and that 7 lead counsel recommends a settlement --</p> <p>8 SPECIAL MASTER: Who is going to object.</p> <p>9 MS. KIRKHAM: -- you have an issue there.</p> <p>10 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Mr. Bonsignore, I saw 11 some activity down there.</p> <p>12 MR. BONSIGNORE: Yes, Your Honor, very briefly 13 I represent six plaintiffs, two of which were named 14 plaintiffs in the settlement class, and we joined and 15 adopted their arguments in my paper. I do agree that 16 they do have separate standing, but in the event --</p> <p>17 thank you.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Good.</p> <p>19 Mr. St. John.</p> <p>20 MR. ST. JOHN: Your Honor, the argument you 21 just made is precisely the holding of Zucker v 22 Occidental Petroleum Corporation. I don't have the 23 cite, but it was Case No. 9756270 decided by the Ninth 24 Circuit on October 19th, 1999. The court has an 25 independent obligation to consider whatever information</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 133</p> <p>1 release.</p> <p>2 Just in the same way that the issues with the 3 LG settlement, none of these objections were raised 4 during the final approval of that settlement, the final 5 judgment entered there. It's understandable that there 6 could be some quibbles with allocation. What's going to 7 happen with that LG money? And that's fine, and that 8 can apply more broadly to the settlements that are now 9 before Your Honor for final approval.</p> <p>10 As a general principle, I don't think 11 defendants have a problem if we tweak the allocation 12 plan. If notice is perhaps sent out again, as long as 13 it's done in a responsible, comprehensive fashion that's 14 really going to lead to final approval, I don't think we 15 have a problem with some of that being done. But we 16 want our deal, which we think is fundamentally sound, 17 approved now. And it's time to do that.</p> <p>18 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. I would like to just 19 take a minute and talk to Ms. Cohen. Give us two 20 minutes and we'll be right back.</p> <p>21 (Recess 1:03 p.m. to 1:07 p.m.)</p> <p>22 SPECIAL MASTER: Okay. Let me ask -- I'm not 23 sure whom -- a question. Mr. Alioto, I guess, you 24 talked about dealing with the Illinois and Washington 25 issues by sort of carving out of your pro rata scheme a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 134</p> <p>1 separate allocation scheme for them. 2 THE WITNESS: Yes. 3 SPECIAL MASTER: Correct? 4 MR. ALIOTO: Yes. 5 SPECIAL MASTER: Could the same kind of 6 arrangement be made to accommodate the -- the Chunghwa 7 settlement if -- if there are disparities between the 8 distribution scheme that was approved by the court in 9 Chunghwa and your distribution scheme? I mean it sort 10 of as a practical matter, you only have \$10 million. 11 What's the practical usefulness of giving notice to all 12 the resellers saying oh, you can now submit claims? 13 I mean I'm trying to find a solution to this 14 Chunghwa problem if it turns out there is one. 15 MR. ALIOTO: Well, certainly to -- to the 16 extent that they were given notice that they weren't 17 going to get anything, and if it turns out that in fact 18 they're not going to be getting anything, that's 19 consistent. And -- and do you have to send another 20 notice to them? I don't think so. 21 But the big question is is there some 22 unfairness there, and is there some inconsistencies, the 23 objector says. I would like to address that first and 24 be absolutely certain. You know, that settlement was 25 many, many years ago, and I don't have the judgment</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 136</p> <p>1 But when I hear discussions of future rounds of 2 briefings, I mean that's why I asked the question 3 before. I thought it was confusing. 4 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I mean, I guess if 5 this -- if I'm going to hew to the court's schedule, 6 then I'm going to need by Thursday some material, and 7 I'll finish with Chunghwa -- just some other material. 8 I'm going to need -- somebody mentioned cases regarding 9 treble -- I'm going to need any cases that you want us 10 to look at that you -- I didn't give you a chance to 11 give me the citations of today -- the docket numbers for 12 the four complaints in this case so we can easily find 13 them and look at what was alleged or not alleged. 14 We're having a handwriting problem. 15 Oh, Ms. Kirkham was going to give me an 16 additional cite to the -- a reference that she made to 17 the Renfrew's report and recommendation. 18 And then information about -- I'd like -- I'd 19 like Mr. Fisher to provide an additional declaration 20 with the updated status of the claim process in as much 21 specificity as he, you know, reasonably and 22 professionally can. 23 And finally we get to Chunghwa, and I -- we 24 definitely need copies of all the relevant documents 25 that allow us to see what was settled and what was</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 135</p> <p>1 memorized, but I'm going to certainly be looking at it. 2 I think maybe the better course there, Your 3 Honor, would be to let us review some of these points 4 that they made and try and identify the problem and then 5 respond to you with this next round of briefing. 6 SPECIAL MASTER: We're not -- we're not talking 7 rounds of briefing here. I mean -- 8 MR. COOPER: What next round of briefing? 9 MR. ALIOTO: Well, with this next submission, I 10 suspect, is probably a better choice of words. 11 MR. COOPER: What next submission? I thought 12 we went through this. There are no next submissions. 13 SPECIAL MASTER: Well, I'm concerned that I do 14 not have the full picture on Chunghwa, and I'm not about 15 to issue a report and recommendation on something I 16 don't feel comfortable that I have the full picture 17 about. 18 MR. COOPER: Well, I did offer, Your Honor, to 19 send you the documents in consultation with Mr. Alioto 20 what documents you should see. 21 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. 22 MR. COOPER: I'm not certain if that helps you 23 or solves the issues, or if you want them to go together 24 with some five-page letter or something not to exceed 25 five pages. I'm sure we can do that relatively quickly.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 137</p> <p>1 ordered there. The question is whether we also need 2 briefing, and I'd like to say no, but I think -- I think 3 -- I think I do. I mean, I think I need something like 4 a three to five pages from the Cooper group explaining 5 why this is a problem and hopefully maybe suggesting 6 what to do about it, and a brief from Mr. Alioto. Now, 7 I think what we should do is maybe have those 8 simultaneous briefs. 9 Can we get those in by Friday? 10 MR. COOPER: That's fine, Your Honor. We will 11 send to Mr. Alioto today the list of documents that we 12 think we need to send you copies of starting with the 13 settlement agreement. Whatever is relevant regarding 14 preliminary approval, final approval and judgments, and 15 we can agree on what documents you should be looking at. 16 And a brief not to exceed five pages -- simultaneous 17 briefs not to exceed five pages by Friday? 18 SPECIAL MASTER: Yes. Can we -- Ms. Cohen is 19 asking for noon on Friday. 20 MR. COOPER: Sure. How about Thursday? 21 MS. COHEN: I would love it. 22 SPECIAL MASTER: Thursday would be great. 23 You've got a lot -- I mean, particularly Mr. Alioto has 24 more on his plate than you do. We're really under the 25 gun here, so Thursday would be very helpful.</p>

35 (Pages 134 - 137)

[& - 764-8700]

Page 1

&	1900 4:21	294-4615 11:7	5
& 3:11 4:12 5:3,12 6:17 7:4 10:3,11 11:3,19 12:4 13:4 14:22 15:2,11,17,21 16:25 17:14,25	19107 4:7 1917 1:6 2:6 1999 131:24 19th 131:24 1:03 133:21 1:07 133:21 1:17 2:18 140:22	2nd 7:8 3 300 11:13 48:25 309-1761 5:23 30th 118:9 313 5:23 314 9:8 317 11:15 3400 5:6 350-0000 8:7 357 7:8 35th 8:14 361 9:21 3771 8:5 393-8293 12:8 39560 8:23 398-4340 4:23 3:07 1:6 2:6	5 1:17 2:19 14:1 84:20 88:2 140:10 50 33:10 50:9 55:23 500 9:19 40:9 505 4:16 51 56:9 70:6,11 5111 1:23 2:21 141:23 514 8:22 516 97:10 52 56:2,3 55 97:9 555 10:5 12:6 56 40:23 563-7200 3:16 567-6565 4:8 576 27:7 28:3 34:6 35:16 76:2 93:2 58 77:7 78:11
05944 1:6 2:6 0921 12:7	2		6
1 4:6 32:16 1.1 31:18 1.5 84:17 1.57 67:18 1.67 115:2,11,16 1/10/16 141:20 10 77:16 88:1 93:2 125:3 134:10 100 115:7,9 10166 11:6 1020 9:19 1060 114:7 10:09 14:2 11000 12:15 1167 67:18 11:34 76:9 11:47 76:9 12 40:23 41:2 77:15 120 6:19 1299 10:22 13 124:9 1449 70:6,11 15 96:22 117:1 140:5 1500 2:17 3:5 155 6:12 15th 20:4 16 66:7 1625 9:12 17 20:5 17th 7:17 10:13 18 77:11,13	2 2:16 3:5 2.7 35:1 2.8 40:11 20 4:14 116:16 200 11:5 49:2 20005-3807 11:23 2015 2:19 2016 1:17 14:1 202 11:24 21 32:19 40:12 139:20 212 11:7 212-3475 8:24 2125 6:19 215 4:8 217-6810 13:8 21st 25:14 22 32:23 77:15,16 139:20,23 22030 5:15 221-5763 6:7 2280 3:14 23 111:3,7 115:23 126:15 237-8562 11:15 23rd 4:6 244-7520 4:16 24th 25:5 2532 6:5 25th 25:6 27 117:4 2700 11:13 28th 25:8,9 2905 9:12	4 84:20 40 64:10 40004-2400 10:23 4041 5:14 41 71:2 410 8:24 415 3:7,16 5:8 6:7 6:14 7:10,19 8:16 10:7,15 12:8,17 13:8 423 113:25 4247 9:6 434-8900 8:16 434-9100 10:15 439-1313 10:7 44 5:6 455 12:15 456 7:17 459 56:12 58:7 61:5 46204 11:14 473 113:24 48226 5:22	60,000 77:24 600 4:21 619 4:23 620 5:21 626-3609 11:24 631-3883 9:8 63111 9:7 65 37:7 693-0700 5:8 698-5200 9:21 6th 106:22
			7
			7 88:1 102:10 700 4:14 701 11:22 703 5:16 703-5908 12:17 706 13:6 715 67:18 719 5:21 764-8700 5:16

768 97:9	125:21 126:12 129:20 130:2,11	added 25:3 addition 127:9 additional 98:3,13 109:10,14,18,21 absence 84:1,3 109:10	affording 40:21 41:4 44:3 afternoon 106:21 ag 57:2 105:13 agenda 118:12 agendas 56:18 ages 77:16 aggregator 106:21 aggregators 71:2 ago 21:17 94:18 134:25
775 114:7	absent 70:12 103:12	address 18:8 24:1 35:6 51:22 124:1 134:23	agree 40:7 45:25 97:22 101:17 105:18 108:24,25 131:15 137:15
781 8:7	absolute 68:10 74:14	adequacy 19:5 21:22 22:3 26:13 32:5 33:12 40:3,3 106:3 110:25	agreed 100:3 108:24 agreement 39:5 115:18 127:18 137:13
78401 9:20	absolutely 64:16 65:13 84:9,11 86:5 126:25 129:5 134:24	adequate 26:10 28:2 28:18 30:6,11 33:7 76:16	agreements 26:18 30:3,10
788-3030 7:10	abuse 114:1,25	adhere 111:6	agrees 44:22
788-7210 7:19	academic 57:11	adjective 75:12	ags 59:11 88:13 93:22 95:11 101:1
797 97:9	acceptable 112:1	adjectives 73:7	ahead 22:9 53:8 71:17 73:17 86:18 86:22 99:22 103:22 113:9
8	accepting 58:16,19	administration 111:14,16	albeit 105:22
80 84:21 116:22	access 49:16,17 102:19	administrator 79:19 82:15 125:21,23	albuquerque 4:15 14:22
80202-1539 9:13	accommodate 27:21 28:22 134:6	admissions 140:9	alioto 3:11,12 14:8,8 20:23 21:22 22:24 23:18,19 26:6,14,16 28:15 29:9,17 32:10
824 97:10	accurate 105:18,25 107:11	adopt 27:11	33:3 35:5 36:1,9,11 36:21 37:11,16,24
83 78:12	accurately 139:17	adopted 131:15	38:2,11,15 39:10
87102 4:15	acknowledging 23:15	adopting 49:5	45:24 51:22,25 52:6
89121 8:6	acknowledgment 95:16	adoption 47:13	52:12 53:1,2,5,17
9	acquaintances 16:15	ads 80:11	53:22,23 54:7 59:4
900 6:12	act 43:4 44:2 45:4 55:16 65:15,15	advance 21:1 96:25	59:9,21 61:9,12,20
92101 4:22	acted 22:16	advanced 20:17 83:9	62:4,10,25 63:5,11
925 6:21	acting 44:14 66:14 66:17	advantaged 104:20	63:20 67:10,24 68:4
94102-7002 12:16	action 41:9 53:14 55:15 60:8 66:6 67:14 129:9 141:16 141:17	advertisement 103:1	73:18 74:10,22 75:7
94103 7:9	actions 1:8 2:8	advice 100:25	
94104 5:7 7:18 8:15 10:6	active 67:1	advocacy 85:2	
94105 12:7	activity 131:11	advocate 21:1	
94111 3:6 13:7	actual 59:12 99:6	advocating 21:3 27:19 85:4	
94111-4109 10:14	ad 80:12,21,21,24	afford 60:1	
94114 6:13	add 57:6 72:17 79:2 96:12 97:1		
94121 6:6			
94123 3:15			
945-0200 6:21			
94598 6:20			
9756270 131:23			
982-5267 3:7			
986-1400 6:14			
9:55 2:18			
a			
a.m. 2:18 14:2 76:9 76:9			
abandoned 21:5 72:14			
abandoning 75:13			
ability 106:23 118:9			
able 33:11 46:25 49:12 68:2,22 78:2			

75:11 76:1,1 79:3 79:10 81:22 82:1,14 85:14 86:1 90:1,2 90:22,24 91:9 92:2 92:7,25 93:11 94:24 95:8,23,24 96:5,10 96:14,25 98:5,6,9 100:11 104:5,19 105:2,12 118:19 119:10,20 120:22 121:16 125:14 127:2 128:21,25 129:14,23 133:23 134:4,15 135:9,19 137:6,11,23 138:4,8 140:13 alioto's 32:12 100:9 118:25 aliotolaw.com 8:17 allegation 63:11 67:3 69:11 alleged 59:13 62:19 136:13,13 alleges 45:3 allocate 90:9 allocated 94:4 allocation 21:12 26:13,21 27:6 28:5 28:9 29:1,7 30:7,14 30:16 39:19 81:25 86:25 87:1,8,8,9,10 87:11,18,23 89:18 89:19 94:5,5,11,15 100:22 101:1 102:16,17,23 104:5 108:15 109:3 110:22 114:2 115:7 115:25 122:22 133:6,11 134:1 allocations 26:25 allow 47:8 100:16 109:4 111:9 121:8 136:25 allowance 68:11	allowed 37:21 51:9 65:1 allowing 42:19 allows 67:6,7 115:20 119:7 alternatives 109:16 ambivalence 23:10 23:20,25 amended 63:4 139:13,18 america 114:6 american 44:16,17 amount 19:25 26:8 26:9 30:4,21 31:10 31:22 32:9,16,17,22 33:7 34:8 35:7 37:6 90:5,8,13 91:4,7 94:3,7 95:9,10,12 95:13,14 112:24 116:9 122:23 132:14,21,24 amounts 87:21 95:11 99:20 analysis 35:2 36:3,3 36:7 46:21 57:22 58:1 103:9 analyze 59:24 analyzed 46:14 anderson 6:10,11 18:2,2,3 andrus 6:10 18:3 andrusanderson.c... 6:15 angles 106:15 announce 17:5 announced 18:7 answer 22:8,11 23:8 50:1 53:18 61:9 63:6 75:8,14 117:20 139:11 140:1 answer's 64:6 ante 79:23 82:8 antitrust 1:5 2:5 44:7,8,9 46:7,23,24 47:16 48:22 65:24	anybody 76:11 78:17 85:20 105:8,8 123:9 anymore 120:16 apart 29:2 41:23 apologize 103:16 119:1,20 123:25 apologized 120:13 apoplectic 68:1 apparently 118:19 118:25 appeals 126:20 appearances 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 appeared 19:14 93:14 appears 44:1 apple 102:13 applied 45:20,21 applies 43:22 45:20 apply 43:2,5,7 133:8 appoint 18:23 23:6 appointed 20:6,15 20:20 21:11 24:8,9 24:22 71:20 129:6,8 129:10,12,15,17 130:7 appointing 130:2 appointment 24:14 131:6 appreciate 16:16 21:10 approach 28:21,25 58:5 approached 39:9 appropriate 22:18 23:12 28:4 31:1 104:25 109:11,25 116:1,17 appropriateness 18:22 19:1 26:4 approval 26:8,9 29:1 30:12 36:13,15 50:5,14 55:16,20	79:22 80:1 81:21 86:24,25 90:19 93:13,23 95:4 96:2 106:7 112:2,4 118:2 118:6 126:13 133:4 133:9,14 137:14,14 approve 33:18 34:7 34:22 127:21 approved 27:14 28:22,25 29:5,6 30:3,5 76:3 133:17 134:8 approving 40:25 60:20 92:16 95:20 96:20 approvingly 114:10 arguably 65:5 argue 70:18 argued 50:5,7 72:21 115:14 argues 124:17 arguing 50:5 argument 1:15 2:15 45:19 47:5 66:11 68:8 82:7 86:6,10 92:10,10,11 93:13 98:23 104:17 108:3 108:8,22 121:19 123:13 126:6,8 131:20 132:3,5 arguments 22:5 39:23 53:10 73:1 92:8 115:16 122:10 123:7 124:1 126:18 131:15 arisen 110:14 arises 46:23 arizona 88:3 arizona's 88:2 arranged 125:23 arrangement 93:25 134:6 arrived 54:10 94:15 article 47:6 64:7
--	--	--	--

articulate 29:24	augment 138:9,15	banner 80:11,21,24	139:12,23
artificially 41:15	authorities 128:22	bar 43:3 69:13	bells 54:20
aside 77:14 100:18	130:19	bargained 30:5	benefit 14:6 101:21
100:19 106:15	authority 24:13	barred 66:1	103:9 110:9,10
108:6,16 112:14	47:6 48:3,4,7 53:11	base 122:9	benefits 44:9,10
asked 20:13,14	53:13,15 64:5,6	based 53:25 54:2,2	best 26:23 57:24
21:24 22:1 34:18	authors 47:18	68:2 94:4,7 99:16	81:13,13 82:10
39:10 103:8,16	authorship 27:13	103:5 106:11 108:7	115:23
136:2 139:9,11	available 32:17	108:24 109:17	better 44:12 66:12
asking 23:13 82:24	37:19 67:25 79:9	111:21 116:6,18	135:2,10
106:22 132:22	82:16	bases 69:1	beyond 70:1 125:3
137:19 139:25	avenue 10:22 11:5	basically 72:19	139:22
assert 57:17 61:16	12:15	115:19	bgralewski 4:24
73:20	avoid 46:3 120:2	basis 54:14 57:19,20	big 74:17 78:6 93:6
asserted 60:14	award 43:24	60:17 85:22 113:15	100:12 121:25
62:20,23,25	aware 37:11 56:24	126:17,17,25	134:21
assistance 124:9	64:25 68:4,6,6	battle 58:19 83:8	billion 31:18 35:1
associated 72:20	101:13,23 103:11	86:7,10	40:11
106:9	106:24 113:20	battles 68:24	birkhaeuser 6:17
assume 82:22 108:3	120:5 121:12	beach 8:23	17:24,25
108:11,22	axes 56:18	bear 60:3 79:24	birkhauser 6:18
assuming 43:6	b		17:25
81:18 108:14	b 4:21 27:11	bears 61:21	bit 25:14 81:23
attached 49:6 95:21	back 20:10 28:7	beat 51:14,14	118:8 119:10
attacked 34:3	29:7 36:13 46:9	120:15	black 4:3 14:18
attacks 68:25	68:19 70:4 76:7	beaten 51:17 66:22	16:24
attempt 29:23 33:1	104:22 108:10	beginning 2:18	blake 94:17
43:1	110:2 115:14	40:17 116:9,14	blame 67:11
attempts 72:18	116:13 117:25	119:9	blaming 67:11,12
attendant 27:1	118:5 133:20	begins 46:22,22	blown 68:10
attention 74:12	background 60:25	behalf 15:2,9,15,18	bob 16:19
113:16 118:13	94:8,11	16:3,20,22 17:14,17	body 65:6
attorney 8:12,20	bad 118:24	17:18 18:1,3,5	bogdanov 7:7 16:25
9:11 12:13 13:12	baker 10:19 11:11	62:20 68:20 99:11	16:25
16:4 19:8,10 28:23	15:15 17:16	102:12 110:20	boies 5:12 15:21
51:8 55:22 56:10,15	bakerbotts.com	126:24 128:4,8,17	boies.com 5:17
79:7 111:1 112:3,9	10:24,25	128:19 129:20	bonsignore 8:3,4
141:17	ball 83:8	130:12	15:9,9 24:4,5,6,7,23
attorneys 3:11	bandas 9:17,18 17:6	beings 78:3	25:5,24 38:22 50:21
44:15 55:23 56:3,17	17:6	believe 20:5 22:1	50:22 51:13,18
58:8 67:7,8 70:13	bandaslawfirm.com	30:7 40:16 50:4	52:12 63:17 67:1,3
93:14 123:21	9:22	68:24 74:22 91:9	67:21 69:5,7,24
attributable 122:6	bank 75:25 114:6	97:2 102:16,21	70:9 71:16 73:11
125:6		103:6,13,20 104:21	74:23 75:15 85:25
		104:23 106:2 120:7	86:1 97:7,8,13,17
		120:21 127:9	

[bonsignore - chance]

Page 5

131:10,12 138:5,6 138:11,16,20 139:2 bonsignore's 53:3 bootstrap 130:10 boschetti 1:23 2:20 141:22 bother 24:19 31:5 botts 10:19 15:15 17:16 bought 41:14,19 42:7 77:21 boulevard 9:6,19 boundary 42:10 box 111:10 boyd 4:12 14:21 bramson 6:17 17:25 bramsonplutzik.co... 6:22 brass 12:5 17:10,10 break 66:21 73:6 76:7 139:9 breath 59:19 brevity 40:2,2 brick 42:16,16,25 43:12,14,15,16,21 45:19 46:2,3 47:1,8 63:25 64:9,11,12,24 66:1 brief 24:25 47:16 49:9 51:3 55:11 61:25 64:22 68:8 70:8,9 77:1 78:9 87:14 90:4,10,11 91:14 97:16 103:7 125:15 129:7,16 137:6,16 briefed 96:18 briefing 75:5 98:13 99:13,14 107:25 121:12 123:20 126:19 132:6 135:5 135:7,8 137:2 briefings 136:2 briefly 50:22 51:15 51:18 63:24 80:5	97:8 124:1 129:3 131:12 briefs 19:15,17 48:9 52:1 60:20 67:20 76:17 123:16 137:8 137:17 bring 56:16 57:12 65:25 73:19 100:14 129:8 bringing 57:14 69:14 120:11 128:2 128:3,4,7,17,18 brings 98:15 broad 4:6 broader 27:9 broadly 133:8 brought 68:20 74:12 75:9 95:16 99:11 105:5 113:16 118:13 127:3 130:17 burden 130:22 business 62:1 84:14 bust 124:22,22 buy 132:17	107:4,20 108:25 111:1 112:3,9 141:2 california's 88:1 call 120:1 called 42:10 campaign 112:20 cap 112:1,7,8 capacity 21:12 128:5,19 capurro 3:13 14:15 14:16 38:5,9 63:13 128:11,14 129:2,3 129:14 130:5,21,25 132:2 care 31:6 32:23 52:14 95:6 101:1,3 130:20 carefully 39:5 carried 121:9,10 cartel 57:18 carve 88:25 95:5 carving 133:25 case 11:19 17:14 31:17 35:1 37:8,20 38:24 41:20,24 42:4 43:21 47:10 48:15 48:16,18 50:3 54:13 54:16 55:2,24 56:7 56:16 57:24 58:6,20 59:1,12 60:21 61:4 62:18 63:2 64:16,17 64:22,25 65:23 66:5 66:11 68:19,21 70:15,15,25 71:6 72:2 73:23 74:1,2 74:15 75:4,23 91:23 91:25 94:13 97:1,9 97:12 100:19 106:9 110:1,15 113:24 115:6,19 119:15,23 125:22,23 127:25 129:5,5,15,19,22 130:23 131:23 136:12 141:12	cases 45:24,24 47:15 48:8 51:3 53:19,25 55:8,17 57:25 64:13 65:11,14,16 70:8 74:16,18 99:16 104:16 108:1 109:18,21,23 110:12,14 112:1 126:22,23 129:6,16 136:8,9 category 120:10 cathode 1:5 2:5 caught 52:22 cause 28:19 29:20 39:6 100:10 causes 124:14 caution 20:1 75:1 cbandas 9:22 ccorbitt 5:9 ccurran 11:25 census 87:20 cent 108:19 center 2:17 3:5 10:13 cert 97:10 certain 33:19 35:5 37:13 48:15 87:19 92:22 93:14 95:1,1 118:20 121:11 134:24 135:22 certainly 19:13 27:19 38:13 41:17 53:25 57:3 74:11 79:20 115:19 126:14 134:15 135:1 certification 33:2 54:18 63:14 certified 2:20 55:25 56:1 63:14 141:1 certify 141:2,15 challenge 57:4 challenging 58:18 chance 19:21 53:1 58:6,9 76:13,22
--	--	---	--

[chance - cohen]

Page 6

136:10	circuits 65:21 113:18,20	109:15 111:22 113:14 114:3 115:3	66:5,6 67:14,15,17 70:11,12,14 71:14
change 20:13,14 39:14 43:7	circumstances 42:8 118:10 120:3	116:8,17 125:21,24	74:3 77:9,25 88:15
changed 23:13 25:13 68:7	citations 49:21 114:17 136:11	claimed 98:21 126:4 139:19	88:16 89:6 91:12,18 91:22 96:7,8 97:22
characterization 107:11	cite 90:10,11 114:19 129:7,16 131:23	claims 30:22 32:6,7 32:10,11,15,23 33:3	98:1 100:6 101:22 105:20 111:12
charged 57:1	136:16	33:12,22,24 34:20	116:10 122:6 124:4
chart 95:21	cited 27:15 36:12 47:15,16 48:9,16,24	39:1,2 40:4,6,20,22 41:2,2,5 43:15,16	124:12,13,17 125:6 127:6,10,13,16
chase 63:25	48:25 51:2 64:16	43:18 45:8 46:4	128:5,19 129:6,8,8
cheaper 77:23	65:18,21 91:14	48:5,14 50:23 51:1	129:10,12,15,17,17
check 82:14 91:11 91:17 96:5	97:15 114:9 126:23	51:9 53:16 54:1,9	129:20 130:16
checks 108:20	130:20,22,23	55:8 57:9 58:17,21	131:14 139:20
chief 47:13	cites 139:15	58:22 59:11,12,13	classactions.us 8:8
chill 63:18	citing 45:24 49:4,9 70:7	59:14,16 60:2,5,6,6	classes 55:25 56:1
choice 42:18 104:11 135:10	citizens 101:3	60:10,13,15 65:2	59:13 75:17 110:8,9
choices 84:15	claim 19:9 33:4	67:5 71:21,25 72:1	clause 113:4
chose 71:8	35:20 42:13,14,24	72:1 73:12,19,21	clayton 7:16 17:2,2
chris 16:21 17:6,13	43:12,20 44:13 46:7	78:4,7,8 79:4,18,19	44:2 65:15
christi 9:20	46:8 47:9 48:1,8	81:24 87:21 98:20	clear 23:8 32:8 53:7
christopher 5:5 9:18 11:20	50:9 57:13,14,17	98:22 99:10,11	54:12 90:4 91:14
chunghwa 12:3 17:11 19:7 50:3,8 54:16 86:13,16 87:2 87:2,7,13,18 89:9 89:14,18,20,22 90:6 90:17,19 91:23 92:16 93:13 94:25 95:18,20 96:20 121:23 124:2,18 125:1,2 134:6,9,14 135:14 136:7,23 140:9	58:9 59:23,24 60:11 61:14 62:12,14,19 62:22 64:4,12 65:25 66:1,16 67:4 68:19 69:1,2,10,12,14,22 71:13 72:24 73:13 73:21 89:8 97:3,4 98:16 100:10 102:12 103:19,22 104:8,14 105:5,10 106:1 108:9 109:12 111:4,7 116:21,25 121:7,8 125:20	100:2,6,12,17,18,19 101:19 102:10,19 103:3,8 104:4,6,10 104:25 105:6 106:23 107:25 108:16 109:7,19 110:4,7,16 111:14 111:16,19,21 112:21,24 116:4,7 116:18 117:11,13 117:23 120:18,19 120:23 124:13 125:22,23 126:3,12 132:18 134:12 139:12	100:4 126:22 139:11,14 140:1
chunghwa's 124:8	clarification 88:11	class 3:10 13:3 19:2	clearly 114:6
cihlar 5:13 15:21,21	126:5 136:20	19:3,4 20:7 32:24	clerk's 37:18
circuit 42:4 44:5,6 48:15,19 64:17 65:21 66:1,4 97:9 110:12,15 113:18 113:20,23,25 114:11 131:24	139:22	33:1 34:13 35:19,22	click 80:22
	claim's 103:21	40:12 41:9,12 42:6	clicks 78:19
	claimant 34:20	43:8 54:18 55:15	client 57:12 62:12
	claimants 27:8	57:20 60:7 61:22	74:23 75:22 97:21
	32:15 56:1 60:9	63:14,14 65:1,24	126:16,22 127:20
	73:25 74:16 104:13		127:21,24 128:17
	105:20,20 106:4		128:19

[cohen - counsel]

Page 7

137:18,21 colleague 63:21 colleagues 98:19 collected 44:4 collectively 30:4 colorable 50:9 columbia 139:21 combined 54:17 come 28:17 29:13 30:8 34:17 42:2 43:1 59:14 61:24 76:7 78:23 85:19 100:12,21,25 106:14 107:9 110:2 114:4 115:8 119:24 123:11 126:12,16 comes 18:8 45:3 94:2 comfortable 135:16 coming 42:4 44:15 61:1 88:15 101:10 comments 19:18 commerce 31:21 commitments 95:17 common 46:4 51:1 82:11 communications 119:22 120:6 companion 105:21 company 70:6 comparability 35:8 compare 35:22 compared 40:10 compensation 31:2 39:20 competition 44:18 competitive 41:22 competitors 85:9 complain 70:18 101:4,5 112:10 complaint 63:4 75:19,19 139:13,18 139:19,22,24 complaints 62:17 73:22 136:12	complete 53:24 82:4 101:22 138:22 completely 34:6 62:11 108:18 completion 141:13 complies 18:10 component 61:21 comprehensive 55:22 56:2 91:24 133:13 compromise 112:16 compromised 58:10 compute 40:14 comscore 81:3,8,8 concept 60:4 conceptually 81:24 concern 28:19 106:13,16,17 concerned 135:13 concerns 27:22 29:15 conclusion 28:17 61:24 114:5 129:21 concocted 53:12 confess 86:14 confidential 38:1 confirm 121:8 confirming 94:19 confused 60:4 86:14 121:1 140:8 confusing 136:3 confusion 49:10 94:2 congratulated 140:6 connection 95:18 consensus 29:24 consequences 107:7 107:8 126:18 consider 28:4 34:5 51:16 77:3 114:1 123:8 129:1 130:18 131:25 139:5 considerably 132:20 consideration 30:23 60:9 115:17	considered 34:2 69:11 79:25 considering 48:9,20 82:24 consistent 134:19 conspiracy 31:18 41:23 124:22 constitutional 93:7 constraints 138:25 constructive 30:1 104:23 consultation 27:4 57:23 135:19 consumer 51:2 consumers 68:20 consuming 126:20 contacted 106:20 contemplated 95:25 contemplation 107:18 contest 57:3 106:2 contested 94:1 115:22 context 47:7 102:23 continually 116:7 continue 116:6 continued 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 contract 20:23 contracts 30:3 77:14 contractual 93:25 contrary 65:17 73:2 91:15 control 70:12,17 controlling 64:17 conversations 119:7 convey 44:9,11 cooper 7:4,5 15:2,4 15:4 16:25 20:2,9 21:18 22:11 23:1,8 23:15 24:17,25 25:8 32:1,5 37:10,17 38:1,7 63:6,8,16 82:22 83:3,21 84:24	85:12 86:18,19,22 88:4,8,18,20,23 89:6,12 95:9 96:7 96:23 118:14,15,25 119:2 120:5,15 121:11 126:8 127:4 127:8,14 128:7,9 132:6 135:8,11,18 135:22 137:4,10,20 138:1 140:7,8,16,19 coopkirk.com 7:11 7:12 copies 62:16,17 136:24 137:12 corbitt 5:4 15:19,20 core 53:10 corners 106:15 corp 97:13 corporate 124:19 corporation 131:22 corporations 78:6 104:20 108:17 109:6 corpus 9:20 correct 31:3,9 44:20 52:6 59:3 65:9 69:20 84:6,10,11 102:8 107:17 122:2 123:4 125:9 127:7,8 128:1,6 134:3 139:24 corrected 52:22 70:2 cost 84:20 97:25 110:3 costs 98:2,4 counsel 14:9 16:6 18:4,23 20:6,15 21:12,12 22:6,21 24:22 25:4,14 27:3 30:16 33:1 38:2,18 53:20 57:23 67:13 68:23 69:21,24 70:12,15 71:10,11 71:12,15,19,19,19
---	--	---	--

[counsel - deficiencies]

Page 8

72:19,20 73:15 76:19 97:22 111:12 118:23 119:7 124:4 124:12,17 125:6 126:11 127:9,24 128:5,19 129:5,6,8 129:10,12,15,17,18 130:2,8 131:5,6,7 132:13 counsel's 40:5 73:19 98:1 121:19 122:6 country 30:22 31:12 31:12,13 32:8 64:23 couple 61:1 63:22 94:18 104:23 105:16 110:21 114:4 121:14 course 30:22 57:7 112:12 135:2 court 1:1 2:1 14:6 18:9 20:13,25 21:15 23:21 25:12,15 35:15 38:16,17 42:17 43:1,6,24 45:3,21,22 46:5,12 46:13 47:2 49:8 51:7 59:19 64:15 79:21 81:18 82:8,11 85:1 86:5 96:2 98:24,25,25 99:22 103:15,17 104:1,15 105:25 106:10,16 109:17 111:18 112:2 113:12,19 115:12,15 117:14 121:7,8 124:8 129:6 129:7,9,11,14,17,25 130:15,17,18 131:24 134:8 court's 130:10 136:5 courthouse 41:6 43:3 75:18 courts 45:14 114:4 114:22	cover 18:18 76:14 covered 18:16 118:11 craft 39:5 craig 5:4 15:19 create 27:25 28:12 72:1 98:19 created 86:15 125:2 creates 87:21 creating 111:13 creek 6:20 critical 44:16 138:7 criticism 101:16 criticized 101:24 crowd 16:9 crt 1:5 2:5 crts 77:21 crucial 91:17 126:15 crutcher 12:4 crystal 100:4 csr 1:23 141:23 cure 72:18 93:4 cured 91:23 curran 11:20 17:14 current 87:24 currently 127:6 cut 39:3,8 63:25 115:3,4 cv 1:6 2:6 83:12 cy 101:20 107:14,15 108:25 109:13 110:6,17 113:6,15 113:21 114:1,9 115:9	d d 7:7 8:12,13 d.c. 10:23 11:23 damage 35:2 37:12 40:11,12 42:1 44:23 62:7 110:9 112:7,8 114:2,24 116:14 damages 34:19 36:16,17 37:7 57:19 62:20 67:6,8 108:7	debated 20:9,11 23:11 december 25:5,8,9 102:10 106:22 decide 21:19 101:9 decided 84:13 131:23 decides 23:6 decision 46:19 47:12 47:23 54:13 57:5 69:13 75:2 82:10 109:24 114:6,7,9 115:1 decisions 57:2 74:6 decisive 138:8 declaration 76:19 80:7,16 111:4 136:19 declarations 76:20 123:21 decline 77:20 deduct 97:25 98:2 deemed 87:24 defect 72:18,21 defects 29:8,10 defendant 55:17 56:2,9,11 124:19 defendants 10:2,10 10:18 11:2,10,18 12:3 15:14,16,18 17:9,9,11,15,17 20:19 26:9 28:2,8 29:6,19,21,23 30:10 31:5 42:19 44:4 50:4,15 52:4 55:9 55:15 56:8,9 57:18 58:20 59:5 62:2 68:17,21 69:1,3,12 72:21 100:3,8 124:21 129:25 132:11 133:11 defense 29:24 defer 26:11 deficiencies 102:21
---	---	--	--

[definitely - effectiveness]

Page 9

definitely 136:24	difficult 57:20 99:4	distinction 59:16	douglas 8:19 15:25
delay 21:7 23:23	digital 80:8,13 81:1	60:18 105:24	downside 106:12
delayed 21:7	diligence 21:14	distinguished	107:2
demand 70:3 72:19	direct 13:3 16:6,11	106:11	dozen 39:10
73:2 120:3	54:23 55:2,3 60:21	distinguishing	dperelman 4:10
demonstratively	100:16 108:13	105:19 112:17,19	dr 40:10,16
40:21	125:24	112:23 113:6	dram 47:14 49:13
denied 97:10 103:10	direction 28:11	distribute 91:5	49:22 78:23 125:22
denver 9:13	141:8	113:14	125:23
department 12:12	directly 106:21	distributed 27:8	drive 5:14 8:5
56:3,11 58:8	119:2	71:3 95:10 107:19	dropped 61:2
depending 35:20	directs 34:12	107:24	due 21:13 25:9
deposition 37:15,23	disadvantage	distributing 89:22	27:20 40:22 41:4
37:25 38:1 141:12	107:20	distribution 52:9,10	76:4 93:7 103:2
deserving 30:11	disagree 112:18	88:12 95:6 108:13	111:3,6 115:22
designated 21:1	disapprove 88:23	114:1 116:4,8 134:8	dug 27:13 39:14
designation 20:19	discovery 21:14,24	134:9	duly 141:6
22:6,21	22:1	distributions 88:9	duncan 4:4 14:17,18
designee 53:1	discretion 53:20	115:9,20 118:18	63:23,24 64:3,16,21
despite 42:13 47:7	106:1 114:1,25	district 1:1,2 2:1,2	65:4,9,13,16,20
determination 41:7	117:14	36:14 64:22 75:20	66:3 79:11,13,14,14
41:8 98:11 113:13	discuss 19:13 35:10	96:2 105:25 139:21	80:19 81:22 83:10
116:6	discussed 110:24	divided 87:19 92:22	dunn 12:4
determine 29:10	discussing 111:11	docket 49:9,14,22	duration 31:19
98:9	113:17	49:23 62:16 136:11	duties 128:6
detroit 5:22	discussion 120:17	139:15	duty 71:9,11,15,20
development 47:15	discussions 74:1,3,4	document 1:7 2:7	71:23,25 130:16
devices 32:25	99:17 120:19 136:1	91:12,17 111:5	e
devised 27:3	disgorgement 47:3	documents 55:24	e 6:18
dictate 75:22	48:18 64:3,12,18	135:19,20 136:24	eadelson 10:8
dictatorship 70:17	65:6 66:4,7	137:11,15	earlier 125:16
diego 4:22	dismiss 68:22,25	dog 93:3 97:23	early 77:9,11 99:19
difference 21:6 23:4	69:4	doing 20:16 21:25	124:12
42:9 58:15 87:25	dismissed 40:24	38:25 41:3 59:19	easily 62:17 136:12
104:16	62:23 63:1 69:10	82:1 98:19 126:25	easy 49:17 105:3,11
differences 89:17	disparate 98:20	doj 124:19,20,24	economic 39:7
different 27:18	105:9	doj.ca.gov 12:18	44:17
29:12 30:20 32:2	disparities 134:7	dollar 33:9 37:6	editors 47:18
33:1 35:20 59:10,11	disparity 41:12	40:10 79:5	effect 35:25 40:25
59:12 68:24 75:12	dispassionately 73:7	dollars 71:3 90:7	41:1 64:23 91:25
83:5,7,14,18 85:6	disposed 124:12	domain 56:25	122:4
89:21 100:25 103:3	dispute 124:7,8	don 16:23	effective 126:3
110:8	disputing 132:2	donald 4:5	effectiveness 80:4
differently 54:25	dissemination 55:7	door 41:6 43:4	
83:15,19 138:21			

[effectuate - eyeballs]

Page 10

effectuate 26:23	entire 22:24 127:10 129:20	104:18 110:6 140:4 everybody's 49:15 evidence 33:19 34:1 34:13 41:15,21,24 entirety 122:8 entitled 43:11 86:1 87:24 93:22 entity 47:11 enunciating 42:20 equitable 43:19 44:13,21 45:9,17 47:2,9 48:21 50:6 62:9,20 65:25 106:1 equity 44:2 erik 10:20 15:15 erik.koons 10:24 error 70:22,22 97:22,25 escrow 132:12,16 especially 24:13 52:18 77:8 85:22 esq 3:12,13 4:4,5,13 4:20 5:4,5,13 6:4 7:5,6,7,15,16 8:4,13 8:21 9:5,18 10:4,12 10:20,21 11:4,12,20 11:21 12:5,14 13:5 13:12 essential 26:19 essentially 21:17 34:5 41:3 50:6 establish 42:24 57:19 established 40:7 estoppel 121:22 124:2,16 evade 108:4 evaluate 22:15 33:11 37:9 82:8 85:5 evaluating 97:11 event 111:17 131:16 eventually 74:5 everybody 19:22 27:18 31:14 50:10	expect 81:18 expectation 90:15 expense 123:10 expensive 126:20 experience 120:20 experienced 110:13 experiences 120:23 expert 22:14 34:25 36:3 77:3 82:23 83:11,14,23 84:2,5 84:23 85:1,18,19,21 expert's 22:15 experts 27:4,4 83:8 85:3 86:7,10 explained 81:7 explaining 137:4 explicitly 44:6 114:23 exposure 106:13 expressed 104:19 extend 98:16 99:1 104:6,17,25 105:7 106:1 107:3 116:6 117:22 extended 19:10 82:4 116:25 extending 82:3 104:10 107:2 extends 111:18 extension 106:5,6 117:11 extensive 54:21 73:24 80:3 112:20 extensively 69:2 129:4 extent 27:10 28:20 60:12 79:24 82:4 122:17 134:16 extra 109:13 extraordinarily 132:24 extreme 75:1 eyeballs 102:25
------------------	-------------------------------	--	---

f	fashioning 60:8 fast 124:4 faulty 28:6 favorably 101:14 fbdlaw.com 4:17 fears 104:20 features 113:6 federal 43:24 44:22 45:3,22,22 46:11,11 46:14,17,18,23 47:7 47:9 48:17 49:8 50:9 53:13 64:3,11 64:19 65:15 75:18 99:22 102:7 108:24 141:12 fee 21:25 122:9 123:9 125:7 feed 81:3 feel 22:20 135:16 feeling 107:1 feels 27:10 104:25 109:25 fees 67:7,8 98:1 112:24 122:18,22 122:23 123:6 fell 41:23 felt 28:20 32:10 42:18 75:23 fiduciary 71:15 128:6 130:15 fifth 5:14 19:8 figure 84:19 94:15 99:5 file 75:18,23 100:2 101:18 103:22,25 105:6 106:23 108:16 138:14 139:4,8 filed 20:11,11,22 24:11 36:12 37:17 37:17,18 38:6,15 49:7 50:13,14,15 68:21 73:12,13,22 81:20 108:9 120:25 121:2 128:12 130:7	filings 26:7 52:16 64:11 final 30:11 50:5,14 70:20,20 81:20,20 87:7 90:19,23 91:7 91:10 92:11,15,18 96:2,6 104:9 106:7 111:17 112:2,4 116:2 118:2 120:24 120:24 121:4 125:14 133:4,4,9,14 137:14 finally 20:22 69:9 136:23 financially 141:15 find 41:10 50:17,19 62:17 63:4 71:25 78:5 81:15 90:10 93:3 97:9 106:17 109:14 129:4 134:13 136:12 fine 4:3 14:18 16:23 79:15 99:14 133:7 137:10 finekaplan.com 4:9 4:10 finger 84:25 finish 136:7 finished 16:12 finn 9:3 17:18,22 18:5 firm 9:4,17 15:5 105:15 127:5,17 first 4:14 18:19,19 25:12 26:4 30:9,19 33:13 46:2,14 82:18 90:3 105:16,18 109:15 110:24 114:25 117:9 125:11 132:23 134:23 139:9 fisher 76:20 77:8 78:12 81:3,6 83:11 83:25,25 84:12 85:10 136:19	fisher's 80:7,15 83:7 five 18:17 135:24,25 137:4,16,17 fix 29:7 72:21,22 98:4,7 99:18 105:11 fixed 32:16 41:14 73:3 87:21 fixing 65:24 77:18 98:7 flawed 78:25 flaws 83:24 84:1 floor 4:6 5:14 7:8,17 8:14 10:13 focus 53:4 59:16,23 99:25 123:2 focused 46:10,11 125:19 folks 38:19 100:1 109:11 follow 23:3 follows 46:17 110:11 foregoing 141:3,5,9 141:11 forestalling 116:8 forget 57:6 85:14 86:17 form 22:4 77:13 105:23 formal 119:11 125:20 formally 63:1 68:12 former 84:12 formerly 127:6 formula 89:21 forth 20:10 94:8 141:4 fortman 9:3 17:19 17:22 18:5 forward 57:17 73:20 75:2 102:2 118:9 fos 7:20 fought 68:23
fall 43:16 false 68:10 familiar 67:8 family 77:21 far 47:21 100:2 114:8 118:5 fashion 64:25 133:13			

[foul - ground]

Page 12

foul 93:4	gary 8:11	given 24:13,14 28:3	99:22 100:10 101:4
found 29:8 73:4	gate 12:15	52:3,3 54:23 56:25	101:5,15,19,24
113:25 114:23	gathered 73:21	60:25 71:20 81:7	107:23 108:5,10
foundational 33:19	geagan 11:4 15:17	96:18 98:21 104:16	110:3,10 111:21,23
four 10:13 62:17	15:17	105:6 106:3 113:13	114:7,13 116:18,25
136:12	general 12:13 19:9	116:9 134:16	119:2,5 120:11
fourth 19:6 63:3	19:10 28:23 29:24	141:10	122:17 123:11,17
139:13,18	30:14 44:15 51:8	gives 130:25	126:19 131:8 133:6
framing 24:18	55:23,23 56:3,10,17	giving 60:9,9 90:20	133:14 134:17,18
francis 7:14,15 15:6	58:8 79:8 93:14	108:6 134:11	135:1 136:5,6,8,9
15:7 17:3 76:25	97:13 101:14 111:1	glad 127:3	136:15 138:14,18
francisco 1:16 2:17	112:3,10 133:10	global 57:18 132:17	139:15,16
3:6,15 5:7 6:6,13	general's 16:4	132:25	gold 140:18
7:9,18 8:15 10:6,14	generally 37:19,19	gmail.com 8:25 9:14	goldberg 4:12,13
12:7,16 13:7 14:1	41:9 88:8 106:2	go 18:13 22:9 29:6	14:20,21,22,25 16:9
15:8	generals 56:15	33:6 37:1 38:17	59:3 101:12 139:6,7
frank 17:13 117:16	generating 103:3	45:25 46:1 49:13	139:7 140:11
free 42:11 123:13	gentlemen 102:24	52:24 53:6,8 57:22	golden 12:15
freedman 4:12	geographic 42:10	59:8 61:15 70:4	good 14:5,7,8,15,17
14:21	germane 79:22	71:12,13,13,17	14:20 15:1,19 23:7
friday 137:9,17,19	getting 30:2 31:9	73:17 75:1,18 84:13	39:12 60:7 61:3
138:3,4 140:10,12	35:24 92:1 93:19	85:21 86:17,22	79:1 83:10 88:3
140:15,15,17	99:25 115:16	87:16 93:17,18	99:25 131:18
friends 16:8	116:18 118:17	95:11 101:5 103:12	google 80:10,10,11
front 93:21 103:11	119:4,9 134:18	103:22 109:13	80:11,12,20,20
109:9	ghost 108:23	113:5,9,21 114:23	goose 42:20
fuel 97:14	gibson 12:4	114:25 115:20	gosh 82:11
full 19:22 51:25,25	gibsondunn.com	116:3 135:23	gotten 35:23 60:15
53:19 98:10 109:7	12:9	goal 27:9,13	60:16 102:6 119:11
110:7 114:24	gidley 11:21	goes 47:25 49:2 58:1	government 65:6
135:14,16	gin 109:19 110:4	68:19 74:18	governmental 47:11
fund 108:11,14	ginning 112:21	going 16:12 20:5	governments 65:5
fundamental 40:19	gist 93:12	23:23 24:19 30:14	grain 39:9
fundamentally 41:6	give 18:15 19:21	32:13,20 33:6,9,10	gralewski 4:20
42:17 133:16	24:15 31:14 47:2	35:21 36:13 39:7,14	16:19,19
further 125:17	48:15,17 51:24 53:1	41:23 46:6,6,9 47:8	grand 9:6
141:11,15	53:18 54:8 62:16	51:20,22 52:16,20	granted 45:17
furtherance 128:5	76:13,22 85:5 89:4	53:6 54:4,5,7 55:10	great 19:17 77:20
future 93:19 136:1	91:1 97:12 100:8,9	55:18,19 56:16	137:22
g			
game 67:11 74:24	100:25 101:20,21	57:17 63:18 73:5,6	greater 111:20
gander 42:21	103:8 108:17,20	73:10,14 76:6 77:2	grind 56:18
garavanian 8:10	109:4,5 117:7	78:8 79:11,21 80:1	grips 42:5
16:2	130:11 133:19	82:9 85:20,23 92:8	griswold 5:21
	136:10,11,15	94:7,16,20,22 95:13	ground 43:9 61:16
	138:18	96:3,5,25 98:25	

[group - important]

Page 13

group 6:3 21:2,2 22:23 77:24 125:17 137:4 groups 104:13 grove 6:19 guess 20:2,9 22:11 22:19 23:15 38:13 48:2 83:6 85:12 133:23 136:4 guido 13:5,9 16:5 gun 137:25	heads 29:13 hear 14:13,14 24:4 48:24 53:21,24 57:2 76:21 136:1 heard 30:19 52:15 65:10 76:23 102:24 hearing 1:15 2:15 18:13 19:22,25 20:5 25:13,20 107:2,8 117:5,20,25 118:3,6 122:18,22,23 123:2 123:17 hearings 126:13 heartburn 29:21 heavily 57:5 held 2:15 66:4 122:20 help 100:1 helpful 38:24 62:15 137:25 helps 135:22 hew 136:5 hey 73:2 115:8 higher 36:5 highest 56:13 highlighting 70:10 highly 57:16,16,16 hire 84:2,5 86:3,5 hired 86:9 hiring 77:3 history 54:13 hit 19:12 hitachi 10:2 15:12 hmm 46:5 hoag 17:13 hofmann 5:3 hogue 17:13 hold 65:16 holding 131:21 hole 66:8 hollander 4:12 14:21 home 42:11 honor 14:15,17 15:6 15:19 17:24 20:10	23:3,9,19,21 25:10 26:17 27:10 29:22 29:25 30:18 31:8,16 31:24 33:18 36:2,20 38:16 47:23 49:18 50:22 51:23 52:8 53:2,8,17,18,24 56:6,24 58:11 62:10 63:20,24 65:22 68:16 69:5,24 70:22 71:18 72:16 73:18 74:17 76:25 77:3 78:1,5,22 79:10,14 82:22 83:10,22 84:24 85:14 91:10 92:15 93:7 94:3 95:25 96:6,8,24 97:8,23 98:10 99:13 99:15 101:23 102:14 103:10,11 103:12,16 104:10 104:11,16,17,24,24 108:14 109:10,24 109:24 112:18 117:10,17,18 121:16,18 122:2,14 122:17,17 123:17 123:25 125:9,14 127:8 128:22 130:6 131:12,20 132:7,9 133:9 135:3,18 137:10 honored 94:20,23 103:23 hope 101:13 hoped 140:4 hopefully 123:22 137:5 horrible 52:17 horse 51:14,15 hostility 43:4 hours 140:4,5 house 28:8 hull 9:16 17:7	human 78:3 hundred 77:5 80:14 hundreds 31:19,20 129:19 hurdle 30:9 hypothetical 29:4 64:7 hypothetically 21:9 21:11 27:24,25 30:25 101:9 i icebreaker 124:6 idea 23:7 40:17 42:5 60:7 78:20 108:8 109:6 116:3 124:5 identified 130:13 identify 14:6 29:11 105:16 135:4 ignore 89:2 96:3 ignored 68:5 ignores 87:1 illinois 42:15,16,25 43:12,14,15,16,21 45:19 46:2,3,25 47:8 63:25 64:9,11 64:12,24 66:1 88:4 88:6,9,13 93:18 94:4,6,11 95:2,7 133:24 illston 46:13 illston's 47:12 imagine 126:3 impact 18:24 61:19 86:13 impacted 97:21 implement 102:1 implemented 27:7 106:4 111:2 implementing 111:13 importance 57:7 important 34:21 37:5 40:2 53:23 54:3 55:24 59:17
---	---	---	--

[important - journal]

Page 14

60:17,22 61:13,24 75:3,3,4 103:1,2 126:11 128:23 importantly 104:22 imposes 106:11 impossible 41:9 impression 80:25 81:2 impressions 80:9,14 80:17,19 improbable 57:16 improper 105:9 inappropriate 34:7 includable 122:9 include 31:23 88:6 includes 80:7 88:4,8 88:12,16 89:6,10 96:7,8 108:19,20 including 31:17 67:15 income 77:24 inconsistencies 134:22 inconsistency 90:2 91:21 92:3,6 94:16 inconsistent 87:10 incorporated 87:9 incorrect 95:13,14 increase 115:11 incredibly 119:25 independent 22:14 77:3 82:23 83:23 84:2,5,22 85:1,5,21 86:6 130:15 131:25 indiana 11:14 indianapolis 11:14 indicated 50:10 85:23 117:18 indirect 3:10 14:9 14:16 15:2 16:17,20 26:22 27:3 38:18 43:4 51:9 53:14 55:17 99:17,21 101:20,21 110:1,10 126:24 132:13	individual 35:1,19 42:1 57:19 77:21,25 individuals 78:3 79:6 109:6 industry 106:25 inflated 41:15 42:8 inform 25:21 information 34:23 38:20,23 39:2 40:15 49:16 79:16,20 81:18 82:16 83:5 120:22 130:17 131:25 136:18 138:12 informed 54:13 informs 111:14 inherent 43:24 initially 85:23 116:14 119:2 injunctive 61:25 62:3,6,19 63:13 100:2 injured 41:18 inquiry 23:16 insert 100:3 insisted 58:20 instance 115:21 instances 114:24 instantly 52:22 institution 73:22 insufficient 103:14 intelligent 123:22 intend 16:6 82:1 intention 20:15 126:10 interest 19:11 24:10 30:2 97:10 119:19 130:16 interested 25:19 141:16 interesting 65:23 79:3,8,17 interests 20:7 21:4 28:23 67:15	intermeddler 126:17 internet 54:20 78:15 interplay 110:16 interrupt 30:25 44:19 interruption 113:10 invaluable 124:6,9 invective 73:8 75:12 invectives 75:8 investigation 71:1 invitation 69:21 involved 51:3 67:5 95:11 ipp 121:19 132:18 139:7 ipps 7:3 8:2 14:19 14:23 15:20,22,23 16:22,24 17:1,3 18:1,3 110:20 issuance 70:3 issue 18:14,14,19 19:1,5,8 20:9 21:10 22:9 24:18 26:3,12 26:15 30:20 31:4 39:16 48:3 49:25 51:20 57:15 62:7,7 62:8 66:22,24 70:1 76:11,12,15,24 79:2 79:17,21 82:2 86:12 91:3,7 93:21 96:15 97:11 98:14 106:19 107:14 108:6 109:1 110:23 112:15 113:19,21 114:9,10 114:23 117:2,19 126:11 130:6 131:9 135:15 issues 18:14,16,18 19:6,10 20:4 21:8 22:16 24:1,10 30:7 30:14 31:15 33:3,11 35:5,10 52:11 56:22 56:24 58:3,4 63:23 67:10 76:8,13 79:12	79:25 91:2 93:7 102:16 107:14 108:19 110:14 113:17 118:21 119:8 121:19 123:2 133:2,25 135:23 issuing 18:21 106:7 112:2 items 19:12 j j 4:20 8:4 11:21 j.scott.stjohn.public 8:25 jams 2:16 3:3 49:19 119:15 janet 34:25 36:3 january 1:17 2:19 14:1 20:5 96:22 117:4 jckress 9:9 jdc 7:11 jennie 6:11,15 18:2 jg 4:17 joe 14:21 john 7:7 8:19,20,21 9:3,5 10:21 15:24 15:24,25 16:25 17:16,18,18,22 18:5 97:20 98:3 121:17 121:18,22 122:2,5 122:14 123:25 124:4 125:2,5,9,11 131:19,20 john.taladay 10:25 joinder 25:2,3 joined 131:14 joint 100:23 jones 41:19 josef 7:5 15:4 joseph 4:13 8:20,21 15:24 139:7 jotted 18:17 journal 55:5
--	---	---	--

[jr - left]

Page 15

jr 4:20	58:17 80:15 84:21	122:18 123:12,12	64:10,19 65:12,21
judge 21:11 23:4,24 24:13,15 25:17,19 34:12 46:13 47:11 47:12,13,13 48:24 49:2,5 60:20 69:9 69:12 73:1,4 93:21 93:21,24 94:1,25 107:3 117:1,18	102:11 134:5 kinds 57:22 100:15 110:14 118:10 126:12 kirby 4:19 16:19 kirkham 7:4,6 15:1 15:1,2 17:1 25:1 39:25 40:1 43:10,13 43:18 44:24 45:2,6 45:11,13 47:10,21 47:23 48:6,13 49:4 49:12,18,20 59:2 65:11,22 66:13,16 66:19 86:20,23 87:13,16 88:6 89:14 89:24 131:2,3,4,9 136:15	127:11 129:25 130:1,11,14 131:4 132:11 134:24 136:21 knowing 33:6 34:20 34:21 knowledge 22:16 known 55:12 79:21 knows 47:17 81:22 82:9 koons 10:20 15:15 15:15 kress 9:4,5 17:18,18 17:20,22 18:5	66:8 67:22 72:5 84:13 108:24,25 115:19 129:4,15 130:21 laws 44:7,8,9,11 46:23,24 lawsuit 62:13 105:7 lawyer 57:12 62:13 84:12 127:19 129:19 lawyers 8:3 26:22 37:20 46:2 67:12,25 70:14 71:13 74:4 83:18 129:13,20
judges 41:10		I	lcd 34:18 35:2,8 37:7 58:16,21 59:4 59:6 66:14 70:25 71:3 112:6,8
judgment 26:23 38:6 41:1 66:12 88:12 90:23 91:7,10 91:16 92:12,16 93:23 96:6 133:5 134:25		l 4:5 11:12 lady 102:24 lake 6:5 land 64:9,10 lane 8:22 language 39:6 96:19 100:3 114:9 large 21:2 36:7 95:14 132:24	lcds 31:16,20 46:13 47:12 77:19,23 112:17 113:3,7
judgments 137:14		larger 31:21 94:21 largest 132:13 larimer 9:12 las 8:6 late 74:24 laura 9:3 17:19,22 lauren 3:13 14:15 62:15	lead 14:8 16:5 18:23 20:6,15 21:12 22:6 22:21,22,23 24:8,22 25:4,14 30:16 40:5 53:20 57:23 67:13 68:23 69:21,24
judicial 121:22 124:2,15		laurenrussell 3:18 law 6:3 7:14 8:12,20 9:4,11,17 15:7 17:2 27:16 43:6 44:1,20 45:8,18,21,22 46:4 46:16,17,17,20,22 47:6,15 48:12,13 51:1 52:18,19 54:1 56:13,16,17,19 57:4 57:8,10 58:3 59:25 60:2,8 61:15 64:7,9	leads 23:6 24:9,15 leapt 46:16 leave 32:24 48:23 52:20 98:12 110:5 118:2,8 124:23 138:19
jumping 52:15		leaves 33:7 leaving 100:18 108:6 127:18	
june 118:9		lee 6:11 18:2	
jurisdictional 130:6		left 33:25 34:1 52:17 71:24 108:19,23	
jurisdictions 32:20 32:23 139:20,23			
jurisprudence 44:16			
justice 12:12 56:3 56:12 58:9			
k			
k 6:4			
kag 6:3			
kaplan 4:3 14:18 16:23 79:15			
kathy 11:12 17:8			
kathy.osborn 11:16			
kayes 70:5,10			
keep 19:18 60:17 96:14 119:8,8,11			
kellogg 110:15			
kern 6:4 16:17,17			
key 112:17			
keyspan 46:12,22 47:10			
kind 28:24 45:17 48:15,20 55:12,13			

[left - master]

Page 16

110:6 113:5 117:23 legal 28:13 legge 69:9,13 73:1,4 93:21,22,24 legge's 94:25 legitimacy 23:16 legitimate 48:3 53:12,12 length 19:17 letter 49:20 70:3 72:19 73:3 114:17 119:14 135:24 lexis 49:4,10,17 114:19 lg 52:1,3 54:16,16 54:17 132:19 133:3 133:7 liability 97:14 life 63:2 84:15 light 68:9 limit 124:11 limitations 54:2 58:4 limited 49:19 70:13 124:20 139:20 line 30:8 42:10,11 42:12 47:5 48:17 74:5 lingered 63:1 list 19:12 81:1 96:24 97:1 125:21 137:11 listed 24:18 listing 94:13 literally 103:1 litigants 124:23 litigate 33:2 litigated 48:7 64:14 69:2 105:22 litigation 1:5 2:5 19:4 55:9 97:14 124:12,15 132:18 little 25:14 36:13 54:8 81:23 118:8 140:13	live 58:9 101:19 llc 9:4 llp 3:11 4:19 5:3,12 5:19 6:10 10:3,11 10:19 11:3,11,19 12:4 logged 21:21 logic 25:24 logical 129:21 logically 30:8 long 8:23 66:25 68:19 81:1 107:12 110:11 133:12 longer 31:18 37:2 98:21 look 41:13,16 58:3,4 60:13 63:3 95:19,19 96:15,19 99:15 110:2 113:7 128:21 129:4 130:19 136:10,13 139:16 looked 34:9 69:17 114:22 looking 109:2 135:1 137:15 looks 49:8 55:21 101:14 loose 124:5 loosely 59:22,23 lost 60:4 69:9 lot 16:8 19:20,23 23:23 24:11 35:16 45:14,23 52:9 73:7 74:15 77:22 93:19 96:21 100:11,13 107:5 113:1,2 125:3 137:23 louis 9:7 love 75:20 85:10 137:21 lower 112:24 luck 42:25 lumber 70:6,11 lump 55:1	lupron 115:1 m m 11:20 machine 141:7 magnitude 96:16 mahler 6:17 17:25 maintain 45:8 making 47:24 57:1 67:24 70:14 101:22 114:2 march 117:1 margin 83:15,19 mario 3:12 14:8 marioalioto 3:17 mark 11:21 market 77:20 marketing 81:4 115:1 marla 13:12 martin 2:16 3:4 11:4 15:17 mason 5:3 massachusetts 50:23 51:1,6 52:18 67:6 68:4,18,20 70:21,23,25 72:7,17 72:20 138:12 massive 54:21 master 2:16 3:4 14:5 14:10,24 16:13,16 17:4,12,20,23 18:6 18:11,21 21:9 22:7 22:25 23:2,14,17 24:2,5,21,24 25:11 25:16,22 26:1 27:24 29:3,16,18 30:17,24 31:4,25 32:4 33:14 34:10 35:3,12,14 36:8,10,19,23 37:1 37:4,14,22 38:4,8 38:10,12,21 39:16 43:5,11,17 44:19,25 45:5,7,12 47:4,20 47:22 48:2,11,23	49:11,15,19,24 50:7 50:20 51:11,16,19 51:24 52:7,25 53:4 53:9 54:6 58:14 59:5,18 61:7,11,18 62:3,5,14 63:3,7,9 63:12,15,17 64:2,15 64:20 65:3,8,10,14 65:18 66:10,15,18 66:20 67:19 68:13 69:6,8,18,23 70:7 70:19 71:5,9,23,25 72:6,10,12,15 73:5 73:14,16 74:8,20 75:5,10 76:6,10 78:10,18,21 79:1,13 80:17 81:17 82:6,17 83:1,4,20 84:1,4,7 84:10,15,19 85:9,25 86:12,20 87:12 88:17,19,21 89:3,9 89:13,16,25 90:18 90:23 91:6,20 92:4 92:13,19,24 93:1,9 94:22 95:5,22 96:1 96:11,15 97:5,12,15 97:18 98:2,12,18 99:3,7,10 101:6 102:3,5,9 103:24 105:2 106:12,20 107:12,18 110:18 112:6,9,12,22 113:1 113:9 114:13,16,21 116:20 117:4,7 118:11,24 119:1,6 120:13 121:5,13,17 121:20,24 122:3,10 122:15,20,25 123:5 123:19,24 124:3,25 125:4,7,10,13 127:1 127:3,11,15,23 128:2,13,16,24 129:2,11 130:4,14 130:24 131:1,8,10 131:18 132:4,8
---	--	---	--

[master - name]

Page 17

133:18,22 134:3,5 135:6,13,21 136:4 137:18,22 138:3,5,9 138:14,18,24 139:4 140:3,15,17,20 master's 21:16 masters 41:10 113:24 114:6,8 material 96:19 136:6,7 math 56:8 matter 23:20,23,24 23:25 30:14 94:1,17 113:19 119:25 134:10 matters 21:25 29:11 matthew 4:4 14:17 79:14 maximum 108:9 mccinney 4:19 16:19 mdl 1:6 2:6 129:19 mduncan 4:9 meadowcrest 8:5 mean 19:14 21:9 27:25 28:10 29:17 30:25 31:10,14 53:9 54:15 78:11 80:7,18 81:24 82:7,24 83:4 83:6 92:8 94:22 96:17 97:5 106:20 119:18 122:11,11 122:22 123:6 129:21,23 134:9,13 135:7 136:2,4 137:3 137:23 meaning 101:20 means 59:24,24 80:19 meant 27:5 94:12 meat 36:24 mechanism 61:13 meet 27:20 37:5 126:21	meetings 31:19 meets 111:2 115:22 member 34:13 35:23 91:18 127:13 member's 35:19 members 19:2,3 20:7 41:13 42:6 43:8 70:12,14 77:10 77:25 91:12,22 memorized 135:1 memory 58:25 91:16 mention 55:13 66:13 91:15 mentioned 74:23 136:8 138:6 meridian 11:13 merit 32:11,12 meritless 40:20,21 41:6 merits 26:14 39:17 39:18 met 79:23 81:16 mexico 14:22 mexio 4:15 mgeagan 11:8 michael 10:12 15:13 micheletti 5:5 16:21 16:21 michigan 5:22 mike 29:22 68:16 milberg 5:19 15:23 105:15 milberg.com 5:24 miller 9:11 18:4,4 million 27:8 28:3 34:6 35:16 40:9 71:3 76:2 80:14 84:17,21 88:1,1,2 90:7 93:2,2 125:3 134:10 mind 18:15 26:15,16 28:1 43:7 51:23 63:21 79:24 86:13 96:14 99:14 123:8	minimize 124:17 minimum 119:9 minute 44:19 59:17 110:5 133:19 minutes 76:7 133:20 140:5 misses 77:24 mission 12:6 mississippi 8:23 missouri 9:7 51:5,5 51:8,11 67:9 68:5 71:1 72:8 73:9 74:9 74:12 mistake 52:21 98:6 119:17 mm 46:5 mockingbird 8:22 modelling 113:24 modifications 115:25 moment 108:8 monetary 39:19 43:19 44:14,21 45:9 45:17 46:11 47:2,9 50:6 58:17,23 62:9 65:25 99:25 money 30:4,21 31:6 31:6,10,23 32:9,13 32:16,23 33:6,10 35:9,17 48:21 75:25 77:22 87:3,19,24 88:25 89:19,22 90:5 90:9,12,16,20 91:1 91:5,8 92:1,4,5,21 93:20,22 94:12,16 95:1,9,10 96:3 100:11,13,16 101:21 108:16,18 109:13 110:3,6 112:13,15,25 113:5 113:13,15 116:8,15 116:22 132:12,15 132:17,21,23,25 133:7	monitors 36:4 montgomery 5:6 6:12 7:17 months 29:2 73:24 moore 8:12,13 16:1 16:1 25:10,11,12,18 33:17,18 34:17 35:13,15,24 36:20 36:22,25 37:3,5 50:2,8 52:8 70:20 70:21 71:6,18,24 72:2,9,11,13 73:12 73:15,16 75:15 86:17 97:2 moot 29:15 morning 14:5,8,15 14:17,20 15:1,19 113:17 motion 18:22 20:6 20:12,20 25:3,13,21 36:12,15 38:10,12 50:14 69:4 81:20 130:7 138:15 139:5 motions 68:21,23,25 motivated 126:5 motor 48:16,18 motors 97:13 move 26:2,3 76:10 76:15 102:1 117:25 118:8 moved 108:20 mscarborough 10:16 mullin 10:11 15:14 multiple 34:18 58:7 61:5,23,23 68:21 115:2 multistate 74:16	n	n 3:12 9:19 11:13 name 14:21 24:7 97:12 128:16 141:19
---	--	---	---	----------	--

[named - offices]

Page 18

named 67:15 127:6 127:6,12,16 131:13	new 4:15 11:6,6 14:22 31:14 33:15	102:24 103:8,18 106:4 109:2,14,18	objection 50:18 103:25 128:12,17
nathan 5:13 15:21	50:23,24,25 51:6	109:21 110:22,25	129:8
national 32:24	61:15 67:7 68:5	111:2,5,6,14 112:20	objections 20:16,18
nationwide 54:16,19 55:4 66:9 67:14 84:16	72:7 73:8 74:8,20 91:23	115:22,24 117:7 118:1 119:4 120:18 125:17,20,24,25	21:5,20 22:20,20 30:13 32:21 36:24 39:18 50:15,16 61:2
natural 78:7 79:6 100:19 101:2,18 102:5,21 103:4,7,18 104:7,12 105:4,8,19 107:4,20	newspaper 54:20 nice 16:9,10,14 82:12	126:2 133:12 134:11,16,20	106:14 107:5,9 121:3 126:24
ncihlar 5:17	nil 58:11	noticed 68:1	127:22 128:3 133:3
near 116:16	nine 56:7,8,8	notices 32:18 54:16	objective 138:7
necessarily 69:20,21	ninth 44:5,6 48:14 48:19 64:17 65:21	54:24 55:2,3,7,24 56:9,12,20,25 58:7	objectively 68:10
necessary 21:19 69:11 106:3,5,6	66:1,4 110:12,15 113:18,20 131:23	58:8 61:5,6 77:5 78:24 102:7 118:18	objector 8:19 9:16 15:24 17:6 134:23
need 24:1 33:10 37:6 39:23 42:23 52:25 69:8 76:14 105:5 114:20 116:3 130:19 136:6,8,9,24 137:1,3,12 140:13 140:13	nod 130:10	notifications 61:23	objectors 8:10 9:3
needed 85:16,18	non 19:2 20:7 21:2 22:4 32:25 33:8,25	notified 56:10,11	15:8 16:1 19:7
needs 33:20,21 76:22	39:21 40:4 44:21 45:9,13 53:14 58:18 58:23 61:8 62:21 66:24	novak 5:20 15:23,23 79:11 105:12,14,14 106:13 107:10 110:19,20 112:8 113:11 114:15,18 114:22	28:23 35:7 56:23
negotiate 100:15 101:25	noon 137:19 138:3,4 140:10,15,17	novo 23:24	60:23,24,25 61:2,3
negotiated 99:20 115:5	normally 121:6	nuisance 60:5,6,10	65:4 76:4,23 85:15
negotiation 28:7 115:10	northern 1:2 2:2 36:14 64:22	60:17 67:4,5	86:3,15 94:10 115:8
neither 141:15	note 35:9 60:21 111:25	number 37:8 40:11 40:11 44:22 47:25	115:13 126:23
network 80:12,20 80:21,24	noted 26:1 84:19 140:22	60:22,23,24 71:10 78:3 80:9 89:21 111:25 124:21	objects 105:8
netz 34:25 36:3 40:16	notice 19:5 22:13,16 26:25 27:4 31:14	numbers 62:16 136:11	obligated 67:14
netz's 37:11 40:11	54:4,5,8,12,17,18,19 54:19,22 55:12,14 55:20 58:15 61:20	nw 10:22 11:22	obligation 130:18 131:25
nevada 8:6	61:22 76:11,16,18 78:25 79:12,23 80:2 81:14,15 82:8,20	o	observation 116:2
never 34:9 37:20 44:5 48:21 58:11 63:1,10 72:13 73:12 73:13 74:10 90:15 130:12	83:16,24 84:16 85:8 88:20,24 89:4,7,14 90:3,4,9,11 91:12 91:17,24,25 93:15 93:15 95:12 98:3 101:16 102:19,23	o'Clock 140:10 oo 14:3 oak 6:19 object 20:25 21:15 25:24 31:8 objecting 7:3 15:2 17:1,3 21:19 52:16 67:12 130:12	observations 110:21 observer 16:7 obtained 115:17 116:13 obtaining 112:4 obvious 52:8,10 109:18,20 131:5

[officially - pending]

Page 19

officially 29:4 127:23	oops 91:25 open 28:24 39:11 65:5 104:6	outs 57:7 60:23 61:4 61:19	park 11:5 part 28:16 36:14,16 38:6 55:14 69:20 71:14 81:24 90:16 94:20 95:3 99:19 104:4,21 127:18
officials 56:13	operative 139:12,18 139:22	outside 43:16 111:9	parte 119:7 120:6
oh 34:3 64:2 86:6 116:10 122:25 134:12 136:15	opine 77:4 opinion 83:6,7 86:2	overcharge 36:4,5,5 36:6	partial 71:1
okay 14:10 22:7 23:14,17 24:6 29:16 30:17 31:25 33:14 34:10 35:16,17 38:21 43:18 45:5 47:4,22 48:23 49:11 49:15 52:7,25 53:2 58:14 59:20,21 61:11 62:4 63:15 64:20 65:3,10 66:10 66:18,21 67:21 68:13 69:7,23 71:5 71:9 72:10,15 73:14 74:20 75:10 76:6	opportunity 18:16 61:17 102:10 103:19 104:7 105:6	overcharges 44:4 overruling 42:18	participate 16:7
47:4,22 48:23 49:11 49:15 52:7,25 53:2 58:14 59:20,21 61:11 62:4 63:15 64:20 65:3,10 66:10 66:18,21 67:21 68:13 69:7,23 71:5 71:9 72:10,15 73:14 74:20 75:10 76:6 78:10 79:13 82:20 83:20 85:25 87:13 87:16 88:19 89:3,9 89:16 91:20 92:14 92:19,24 100:8 101:1 102:15 107:12 108:12,15 109:1,5 110:4,18 114:18,23 118:11 119:6 125:4,10,13 127:1,12,15,23 128:2,24 130:24 131:4,10 133:18,22 138:16,20 140:16	oppose 129:9 opposed 34:14 87:22	pac 70:11 pacific 70:5 package 94:21 page 48:25 49:2 124:9 135:24	particular 18:17 120:9
old 16:15 77:10 116:21	opposite 24:17 42:9 opposition 25:2 38:6 50:16 68:22	pages 49:5 135:25 137:4,16,17	particularly 19:17 106:17 114:18 115:21 120:19 124:20 137:23
olds 77:13	oppositions 25:9 opt 57:7 60:23 61:4 61:13,19 103:2	paging 49:6 paid 30:4 31:2,6 32:10,10,11,20 50:10 80:12 87:4 89:15 90:5 94:16 95:1 132:15,20,24 132:25	parties 38:19 parting 132:10
omitted 19:4 39:21 62:22	oral 1:15 2:15 19:25 123:13	panasonic 11:2 15:18	parts 107:21
once 24:9 52:21 83:21	order 18:17 23:21 32:2,5 33:18 38:3 38:19 42:24 49:5 93:23 94:6 95:19 119:6 120:3,6 130:2	panel 34:19,20 36:22 37:6,7 40:14	party 97:24 141:17
ones 50:24 101:15 101:24 105:5,10,21	ordered 137:1 orders 90:25 96:20 oregon 46:15,20,22 65:8 66:14 88:4,9 88:13 93:18 94:4,6 94:11,16 95:2,7	paper 50:4 114:12 131:15	pass 43:20,21 46:25
ongoing 79:18 121:6	organized 119:10 original 36:18 50:3 50:18 118:22 141:12	papers 36:18 40:10 50:4,10,17,18 52:13 54:11 62:11 69:17 74:24 75:16 81:20 103:16 105:17	passing 55:13
	originally 68:20 115:7	120:25 121:2,4 125:18 126:7 127:5 128:11,13,14,16	passthrough 42:19 42:24
	osborn 11:12 17:8,8 ought 22:14 27:7,8 60:8	parens 66:16 99:8 102:12 104:13 105:5,7,10,21 106:9	paths 104:3
	outlined 29:25	81:1	patience 69:10
	outreach 80:8,14		patriac 66:16
			patriae 99:8 102:12 105:21
			patrick 7:16 17:2
			paul 5:20 15:23 105:12,14
			pay 32:13 97:25 100:10
			payment 60:11 92:17 95:25 108:7
			payments 60:9 88:13 89:10,10 95:3 98:4,5
			peace 132:17
			peep 52:5
			pending 18:23 59:12 59:14 63:6,8,16 103:11 105:22 106:9 139:12,19,19 139:22

[pennsylvania - pres]

Page 20

pennsylvania 4:7 10:22	persuade 100:3 persuasive 106:18 pertains 141:11 petroleum 131:22 phase 81:25 philadelphia 4:7 14:18	play 67:11 playing 124:4 plays 103:15,17 plaza 4:14 pleading 46:3 please 19:18 37:14 llc 8:3 plodding 89:4 plus 40:9 77:5 80:14 84:21 90:7	possible 26:7 32:22 84:18 possibly 42:13 57:25 58:13 postdated 50:24 posted 118:18 119:15,23 posture 105:19 106:11
people 14:13 19:16 19:20 21:1,2 22:1,5 22:23 31:2 32:14,19 32:25 33:7 34:8 37:20 39:3 43:3,22 48:17,24 56:17,18 56:18 57:1,23,25 58:17,23 60:14 62:21 64:13 66:23 71:10,24 73:20 75:14,16 77:17 78:15 87:23 88:24 89:1 98:22 99:6 100:17,20 101:2,18 102:5,21 103:4,7,19 103:22,23 104:12 105:8 107:5,20 108:6,9,16,17,19,21 116:20 117:13 118:1 119:18 125:22 126:4	philips 10:18 15:16 17:17 121:23,24 phone 14:14 17:4 18:7 71:12 120:1 phonetic 94:18 pickup 97:14 picture 12:3 17:11 53:19 135:14,16 138:22 pie 89:8 piecemeal 28:25 pipe 129:24 place 23:22 97:3 141:4	plutzik 6:17 17:25 pnovak 5:24 point 26:17 31:9 35:12,14 50:2 56:6 58:16 61:18 65:23 66:9 70:1,5,13 72:17,22 75:6,11 80:3,5 83:10 84:22 88:7 97:2 104:9,10 104:19 109:23 113:8,11,12,21 115:12 117:13,17 118:4 121:24 124:25 126:15 128:23 130:1	pots 87:21 power 43:24 powers 24:14,15 practicable 81:13 82:10 90:9 115:24 practical 93:1 116:23 134:10,11 practically 99:3,4 practice 44:17 84:13 pragmatic 58:5 precisely 80:9 95:8 124:15,24 131:21 predicate 44:1 132:19 prefer 118:7 preference 108:13 prejudice 40:24 preliminarily 95:20 preliminary 26:5 36:12,15 55:16,19 80:1 93:23 118:6 137:14
percent 33:10 77:7 78:11,12 84:21 115:7,9	plaintiff 42:23 48:22 64:18 65:1,7,24 66:5,6,14 74:10,12 plaintiffs 3:10 13:3 14:16 15:3,10 16:11 16:18,20 24:16 42:21 46:3 50:14 67:15,16,25 68:4 72:3,6,7 74:7 86:4 99:18,21,24 101:2 110:2 115:6 130:12 131:13,14	pointed 115:2 132:13 pointing 131:4 points 67:19 77:9 105:16 121:16 125:14 135:3 138:8	premature 18:20 20:3 22:8,12 24:9 24:12
perfect 18:12 113:7 period 41:14,21,24 66:7 77:11,13,18 92:20 111:20 116:10,14,21	plan 26:13,21,24 27:3,6,6,7,11,12,17 28:5,9 29:7 30:16 39:19 86:25 87:1,8 87:8,9,10,11,23,25 89:18,19,23 103:25 104:5 108:15 109:2	pooh 61:17,17 popular 25:7 population 94:5,5,7 position 24:17 51:8 85:2 91:21 100:5 129:9	preparation 25:6 prepare 55:20 prepared 35:6 pres 101:20 107:14 107:15 108:25
permits 120:3 129:5 person 41:25 43:25 69:25	persons 78:8 104:7 105:4 107:4 perspective 22:15 73:19 109:4 132:11	positive 39:12 117:12 possesses 106:1 possessors 40:22 possibility 85:13 117:21	

[pres - questions]

Page 21

109:13 110:6,17 113:6,15,22 114:1,9 115:9 prescott 3:11 present 13:11 67:12 presentation 105:17 presentations 95:15 presented 86:8,9 press 74:13 presumably 21:23 presume 50:1 pretty 36:1 41:5 61:3 76:21 77:1 prevailed 69:3,12 73:1 preview 54:8 price 41:14,15,22 65:24 77:18 100:7 pride 27:12 primary 30:2 106:13,16 principle 133:10 prior 50:25 141:5 private 44:10,15 64:18,25 65:1,7 66:5,6,14 99:24 101:2 124:23 pro 87:22 89:23 95:6,10,13 107:19 133:25 probably 19:20 23:4 42:25 44:12 45:13 46:18 57:19 61:22 81:22 107:10 114:5 135:10 problem 30:15 51:14 56:22 72:23 77:8 79:17 86:15,24 86:25 87:6 88:18 93:3,6,9,10 101:4 116:7,24 126:1 130:9 133:11,15 134:14 135:4 136:14 137:5	problems 16:10 27:25 28:13 76:17 95:17 98:8 procedural 28:13 69:1 70:1 119:8,25 120:8 130:5 procedure 32:14 procedures 41:5 proceed 28:13 29:20 39:7 113:14 proceeding 20:16,18 proceedings 126:10 141:3,5,7,13 process 27:20 40:22 41:4 73:24,25 79:18 81:24 93:8 103:2 104:4 111:3,6,15 115:23 116:4 121:8 121:9 126:21 136:20 processing 79:20 product 41:14,20 42:7 88:16 products 55:9 97:14 professionally 136:22 professionals 81:4 proffer 90:7 proffered 74:23 program 54:12 55:14 78:25 82:8 83:25 100:17 125:20 programs 54:21,22 111:6,8 progress 39:15 121:7 projection 108:1 projections 81:11 promise 90:16 promote 101:10 proof 43:19,21 45:18 proper 110:11	properly 122:7,8 proportionate 87:20 proposal 28:17 117:22 118:8 propose 29:7 proposed 28:5 29:4 29:14 30:16 55:19 89:23 104:3 109:16 proposing 39:1 propriety 21:22 prosecute 124:21 prosecuted 124:19 protect 130:16 protection 51:2 protective 38:3,19 protects 61:14 protocol 110:12,13 protocols 118:17 119:4 prove 36:16 46:24 46:25 47:1 proves 43:25 provide 59:25 81:18 83:6 126:23 136:19 139:2 provided 92:17,21 93:11 96:3 108:2 provides 87:8,18 providing 138:12 provision 88:14 90:20 91:1,19 92:21 94:24 107:15 provisions 26:25 public 56:25 publication 55:5,6 114:11 publications 55:6 pull 24:23 96:23 punitive 67:7 purchase 16:11 purchased 41:25 purchaser 3:10 13:3 14:16 15:3 16:18,20 26:22 27:3 38:18 43:4 51:9 55:17	60:21 99:17,21 110:1 132:14 purchasers 14:9 16:6 39:20 42:1 53:14 54:23 55:4 126:25 purchases 40:12 116:13 purported 41:12 purpose 94:14 purposes 41:17 102:17,17 103:2,3 106:7 111:13 112:2 112:4,21 pursuant 117:22 pursue 47:8 53:15 65:1 69:21 85:23 pursued 71:22 72:13 pushed 118:5 put 24:7,19 26:22 29:13 42:19,21 45:15 52:13 70:24 71:7 75:2 77:14 78:7,8 84:25 85:7 90:13 103:18 132:11,17 putative 71:19 puts 104:2 putting 85:3
q			
question 20:11,20 22:8 23:9,10 26:5 33:13 40:19 48:1,20 53:11 59:15 60:5 61:10 64:1,4 65:5 78:7 98:5 99:5 108:4 109:9 119:3 120:17,21 122:16 127:11 133:23 134:21 136:2 137:1 139:10 questions 21:8 82:21 85:8 118:17			

[questions - relief]

Page 22

126:19 quibbles 133:6 quibbling 83:14 120:8,8 quick 72:17 122:16 quickly 87:17 117:2 117:19 135:25 quinn 2:16 3:4 14:20 quite 26:11 36:17 75:12 90:4 91:10,14 119:10 quote 44:14 111:5 120:24,24 quoted 50:18 quotes 91:24	reached 78:15 reaction 57:3 read 19:15 42:3 48:18 66:11 67:23 76:17 91:18 122:13 reading 122:12 ready 74:25 real 40:18 62:5 87:25 realize 19:15 21:25 52:11 really 27:25 30:13 39:17,23 40:19 42:3 52:25 53:9 54:9 55:13 57:5 81:9 86:15 96:18 101:1,3 104:2 110:2 120:2 125:5 133:14 137:24 reason 22:17,21 83:22,23 93:4 reasonable 26:10 27:6,10,11,12,21 28:3,18,21 30:6,11 53:16 59:15 83:17 83:17 reasonableness 18:25 26:13 reasonably 136:21 reasons 22:12 59:7 59:11 81:14 103:6 115:24 recall 31:16 34:15 72:17,25 138:10 recast 46:7 receive 87:24 111:23 115:8 received 79:19 recess 76:9 133:21 recited 91:9 93:24 recites 90:10 recognize 105:23 106:8 118:4 130:8 recognized 91:4	recognizes 111:2 recommend 104:24 116:24 117:18 recommendation 18:21 19:24 20:4 21:16 22:10 47:14 48:25 49:1,23 117:11 135:15 136:17 139:1 recommendations 21:20 recommended 103:24 117:11 recommending 107:3 recommends 131:7 record 33:20,23 34:16,18,24 35:9,25 36:10,11 37:12 38:2 38:5,16,17 53:3,7 61:3 68:2,14 80:3 81:14 83:12,13 85:22 96:17 101:12 101:22 107:23 127:9,19,24 138:10 138:15 139:10,14 140:1,21 141:6,9 records 98:10 recover 42:14 recovered 22:4 recovery 39:7 44:1,1 44:3,20 46:11,12 100:16 redoes 49:21 reduce 125:7 reduces 32:16,17 refer 129:16,17 reference 55:11 56:5 119:6 120:3,6 136:16 referenced 38:9 references 111:5 referred 26:20 104:5	referring 37:13 49:3 60:1 90:25 92:7 121:4,20 refined 103:9,9 109:4 reflect 125:8 reform 104:4 regard 21:22,24 22:2,13 40:4 51:5 67:4 95:17 120:18 120:22 regarding 136:8 137:13 138:12 regardless 132:1 regards 70:21 regrets 124:15 reign 51:25 rejected 82:25 83:1 relates 1:7 2:7 111:16 118:17 relating 19:7 relationship 38:24 110:22 relative 141:16 relatively 90:5 135:25 release 30:22 52:1,2 52:3 58:20 100:9 132:21 133:1 released 34:8 40:23 58:22,24 releases 26:25 30:5 30:20,21 31:1,7 59:6 61:21 releasing 19:2,3 relevant 72:3 136:24 137:13 reliance 101:25 relied 91:18 100:20 relief 23:22 43:19 44:14,21 45:9,17 47:9 48:16 50:6 58:17,23 61:25 62:3 62:7,9,20,20 63:13 99:25 100:2 101:21
--	---	---	--

rely 67:9	135:15 136:17	residue 100:1	reviewed 23:24
remaining 113:14	139:1	108:23	73:23
118:12	reported 1:22	resolve 98:8	reviewer 86:4
remarks 63:22	reporter 2:20 18:9	resources 49:19	revise 115:10
132:10	18:10 59:19,20	124:21	revised 115:18
remediated 72:23	88:11 141:2	respect 65:12,15	revision 115:13
remedy 47:2 60:1	reporter's 14:7	68:18 76:4 90:3	revisit 24:11
64:18 65:6 66:5,7	reporting 81:25	91:21 108:25	richter 10:11
remember 25:6	121:7 139:17	110:21 113:12	rid 32:24
31:16 58:21 59:21	represent 20:6 33:1	115:16 126:8	right 17:4,23 18:6,8
75:5 122:11,12	67:14,17 74:11	respectfully 78:4	18:12 24:1,2 25:22
remind 24:21 67:13	102:6 127:6,12,16	respond 35:3 51:19	26:2,2 28:1 36:19
reminded 68:7	131:13	92:9 105:13 110:19	38:4 39:16 43:1,17
reminding 70:10	representations	135:5	44:22 46:14,18,19
reminds 116:10	124:14	responded 104:21	46:23 47:25 49:24
renew 16:15	representative	responding 79:11	50:20,20 51:16
renfrew 49:2	71:14 127:7,16	118:22	53:13,17 56:8 58:25
renfrew's 47:13	representatives 74:3	response 20:20 25:2	59:14 61:20 63:12
48:24 136:17	represented 75:17	36:21 56:19,21 69:5	63:15,20 66:15
renoticing 32:21	75:18 124:7	82:25	69:15 70:19 71:22
repealer 19:2,3 20:7	representing 17:21	responses 76:19	76:2 77:13 78:21
21:2 22:4 31:22	52:16 75:13 97:21	117:8 121:3	83:3 84:9 86:12
32:25 33:8,8,25,25	126:22	responsibilities 23:5	88:6 89:12 92:19,25
39:21,21 40:4 44:21	request 23:22 24:8	responsibility 69:25	96:13 98:12 101:8
45:9,13 51:11 53:14	24:22 25:2,3 37:10	70:11 71:21 74:17	102:25 105:11
58:18,23 61:8 62:21	68:1,11 123:9,10	responsible 97:24	112:22 114:21
62:22 66:24,24	125:8	98:7 133:13	121:14 123:23
76:12	requested 141:14	rest 124:23	126:14 133:20
repeat 19:16 60:19	requests 68:13	restitution 47:3	140:3,20
77:2 78:8	require 28:8 43:19	restive 19:16	rights 21:4 39:6
repeated 39:24 40:5	43:21 115:21	result 28:6	57:14 93:16
repeatedly 52:13	required 55:15	results 80:12,12	ripe 23:25
67:20	requirement 126:21	82:12	risk 58:6
repeating 24:20	requirements 81:15	retain 85:18,20	road 6:19
103:17	111:3,3,7,9,12	retained 85:19	robert 4:20 8:4 15:9
replace 100:6	115:23	retains 117:14	24:7
reply 24:25 34:3	research 13:12	returned 80:13	robust 81:15 82:17
50:16 64:21 68:8	resellers 88:16 89:7	reversed 46:10	rocket 125:12
report 18:21 19:23	89:8,11,15,19 90:3	reversing 44:3	rockhurst 8:10 16:2
20:3 21:16,20 22:9	90:12,21 91:2,22	reversionary 113:3	roll 107:13
25:20 34:25 36:8	92:4,5,17 95:22,25	113:4	room 66:23 71:11
37:11,12,22 38:14	96:3,8,9 97:4,5 98:4	review 47:6 57:9	round 135:5,8
47:14 48:24 49:1,3	134:12	58:3 64:7 135:3	rounds 68:25 135:7
49:23 56:2 82:15	residents 39:20	139:23 141:13	136:1
117:10 121:2	98:21		

[rule - settlements]

Page 24

rule 32:5 36:14 41:2 42:16,20 43:2 45:20 111:3,7 115:23 117:1,19 126:15	102:11,15 123:1 129:23 134:12	seal 38:17 sean 9:16 17:6 search 80:10,12,12	131:16 134:1 separately 117:2
ruled 38:13 93:22	says 27:16 33:4 35:24 47:1,7 64:17	second 15:4 19:1 102:13 112:23	serious 107:2 served 71:11
rules 40:23	66:11 78:12 89:7 90:12 91:8,25 94:6	113:23,25 117:17 120:17 132:13	serving 25:25 set 20:13 27:2 44:13
ruling 41:1,2 93:24 94:1,25 123:22	95:12 98:24,25 105:3 107:23 120:5	seconds 70:2 secret 55:10	94:6 98:13 99:13 108:16 110:12
rulings 55:25	134:23	secretly 122:20 section 66:7	118:7,20 123:13 141:4
run 18:12 64:11,24 65:12 66:2 75:7,8 100:16 108:18 129:22	sc 1:6 2:6 scarborough 10:12 15:13,13 29:22,22	securities 41:20 security 41:21	sets 26:18 setting 94:8
runs 82:5	30:19 68:16,17 69:16,19 72:16 132:9	see 16:7,9,10,12,14 16:14 37:21 39:25	settle 31:12 53:25 54:14 59:15
s			
s 8:20,21 12:5	scarpulla 7:14,15 15:6,6,7 17:3 20:3	scarpulla 7:14,15 42:4 47:4 62:15	settled 31:17 32:15 33:13 53:19 55:18
sake 108:3,8,22	22:22 23:2,3 30:17	77:6 82:12,20 87:25	99:7,16 115:13 136:25
sales 40:15 77:20	30:18 31:3,8 34:11	89:16 90:22 102:17	settlement 18:22,25
salt 39:9	53:21 76:25,25	102:20 122:15,25	19:7 21:23 22:3
sampco1 9:14	78:14,20,22 83:20	132:22 135:20	26:8,10,18,20 27:14
samsung 10:10 15:14 29:23 68:17 121:23,25	83:22 84:3,6,9,11	136:25 139:24	28:2,5,22,25 29:3,5
san 1:16 2:17 3:6,15 4:22 5:7 6:6,13 7:9 7:18 8:15 10:6,14 12:7,16 13:7 14:1 15:8	84:16,20 85:17 86:2	seeing 25:20 32:21 34:16 103:5	31:21 32:6 33:12,19
sandbagged 123:10	92:14,15,20 93:6	seek 57:18 67:17	34:7,15,22,23 35:8
sansome 8:14 13:6	118:20 119:20	seeks 67:10	35:22,24 37:6 39:5
satisfy 79:7	122:16,24 123:4,15	seen 16:8 91:11	40:4,10,25 41:9,17
sauce 42:20,21	123:23 126:8	sees 80:22	50:3 52:2 54:10,17
saveri 13:4,4,5 16:5 16:5,14	127:15,18 128:1,7	self 25:25	55:19 58:24 70:24
saveri.com 13:9	scarpullalaw.com 7:20	send 49:18 73:2 78:24 96:23,24,25	71:7 79:22 86:14,16
saw 37:20 38:13 78:17 80:24 103:1 131:10	scenes 100:23,24	101:16 134:19	86:16,24 87:2,2,7
saying 29:2 32:2 41:8 43:9 44:25 46:15 48:2,17,19,21 56:15 65:23 76:22 78:14,15 86:15 89:17 90:25 94:10	schedule 20:12,14 20:14 21:19 22:10 23:13 25:1 85:15,16 98:13 121:12 136:5	135:19 137:11,12	87:19 88:15 89:10
	scheduled 23:22	sending 28:7 72:19 96:25	90:6,7,14,17,19,20
	scheduling 120:7	sends 55:22	92:16 93:5,11,14,20
	scheme 133:25 134:1,8,9	sense 25:25 35:18 64:5 82:12	94:3,19,25 95:4,18
	science 58:2,2	sensitivities 106:8	95:20 96:2,8,20
	scope 52:2 55:4	sent 56:9 91:18 118:22 119:3,18	97:6 99:19 106:8
	scrounge 71:13	125:24 133:12	107:16 115:4,10,14
	sdi 10:10 15:14 29:23 68:17	sentence 126:7	115:18 124:5,13,18
		separate 26:7,11 33:5 38:17 54:18,25	124:22 125:1,2
		105:23 123:17	126:13 129:9 131:7
			131:14 132:14
			133:3,4 134:7,24
			137:13
			settlements 20:22 26:17,19,24 27:2,17

[settlements - spoken]

Page 25

50:25 52:4 54:24,25 56:7 60:8,21 88:14 100:23 101:25 112:5 121:23 122:8 133:8 settling 32:7 shades 102:15 shaking 96:11 shape 19:24 22:4 share 95:13 sharpen 63:22 shepard 15:14 sheppard 10:11 sheppardmullin.co... 10:16 sherman 45:4 65:15 shoe 42:18 shoreline 9:19 shorthand 2:20 141:1,7 shot 102:22 103:5,7 show 36:16 43:2 76:5 130:22 showing 21:21 22:2 36:18 94:14 shown 81:10 shows 130:8 side 23:13,20 30:2 42:11,12 48:8 51:21 76:5,23 98:19 sidelines 57:13 sides 42:9 85:3,4 signature 141:22 signed 38:3 significance 84:17 significant 89:17 silenced 131:6 similar 51:6 54:19 114:5 simple 75:7,14 simply 45:18 64:11 73:2 87:6 111:21 simultaneous 137:8 137:16 140:9,19	single 108:7,10,12 108:17 110:23 111:23 sir 68:15 97:19 123:24 sit 63:18 sits 43:22 sitting 57:13 132:15 situated 35:21 situation 41:11 42:2 42:6,15 43:23,25 44:12 48:21 51:6 99:18 104:2 129:18 six 55:7 77:10 131:13 size 122:5 skip 67:22 slightly 83:15 sloughing 75:14 small 36:6 60:24 90:5,8,13 91:4,6,7 96:15 122:3 124:5,5 124:13,21 smaller 132:20 smarter 86:4 society 44:10,11 solicited 87:22 solution 97:24 105:3 106:10 134:13 solutions 104:23 solved 29:12 solves 135:23 somebody 75:2 136:8 somebody's 27:22 soon 43:20 118:6 sooner 81:19 sorry 30:24 49:9 53:22 77:16 89:3 99:1 105:9 113:3 117:3 sort 19:16 100:1 101:20 109:18 110:9,16 130:18 132:10 133:25	134:9 sorts 98:20 sought 93:13 sound 43:6 133:16 sounds 92:5 source 130:17 south 4:6 9:6 speak 14:11 53:22 80:5 83:21 129:20 130:11 special 2:15 3:4 14:5 14:10,24 16:13,16 17:4,12,20,23 18:6 18:11,20 21:9,15 22:7,25 23:2,14,17 24:2,5,21,24 25:11 25:16,22 26:1 27:24 29:3,16,18 30:17,24 31:4,25 32:4 33:14 34:10 35:3,12,14 36:8,10,19,23 37:1 37:4,14,22 38:4,8 38:10,12,21 39:16 41:10 43:5,11,17 44:19,25 45:5,7,12 47:4,20,22 48:2,11 48:23 49:11,15,19 49:24 50:7,20 51:11 51:16,19,24 52:7,25 53:4,9 54:6 58:14 59:5,18 61:7,11,18 62:3,5,14 63:3,7,9 63:12,15,17 64:2,15 64:20 65:3,8,10,14 65:18 66:10,15,18 66:20 67:19 68:13 69:6,8,18,23 70:7 70:19 71:5,9,23,25 72:6,10,12,15 73:5 73:14,16 74:8,20 75:5,10 76:6,10 78:10,18,21 79:1,13 80:17 81:17 82:6,17 83:1,4,20 84:1,4,7 84:10,15,19 85:9,25	86:12,20 87:12 88:17,19,21 89:3,9 89:13,16,25 90:18 90:23 91:6,20 92:4 92:13,19,24 93:1,9 94:22 95:5,22 96:1 96:11,15 97:5,12,15 97:18 98:2,12,18 99:3,7,10 101:6 102:3,5,9 103:24 105:2,4 106:12,20 107:12,18 110:18 112:6,9,12,22 113:1 113:9 114:13,16,21 116:20 117:4,7 118:11,24 119:1,6 120:13 121:5,13,17 121:20,24 122:3,10 122:15,20,25 123:5 123:19,24 124:3,25 125:4,7,10,13 127:1 127:3,11,15,23 128:2,13,16,24 129:2,11 130:4,14 130:24 131:1,8,10 131:18 132:4,8 133:18,22 134:3,5 135:6,13,21 136:4 137:18,22 138:3,5,9 138:14,18,24 139:4 140:3,15,17,20 specific 87:3 97:11 110:9 specifically 44:2 113:23 specificity 136:21 speculative 62:12 speed 76:21 spelled 26:24 spend 19:24 33:14 split 48:3,4 53:11,12 53:15 64:4,6 spoke 94:17 spoken 113:18
---	--	--	--

[spreading - taken]

Page 26

spreading 31:11,13	states 1:1 2:1 19:2,3 20:8 21:3 31:17,22 33:8,8,24 34:1 39:4 39:21,22 40:12,13 40:16 43:8 44:21 45:9,14 50:9 51:10 52:14,17,21 53:14 56:11 58:18,23 61:8 62:21,22 67:5 71:4 74:17 87:19 88:24 91:1 94:12,14,17 95:21 98:5 111:5 112:16 139:21 statistic 80:6	submissions 135:12 submit 20:3 49:20 91:3 102:10 114:15 114:16 117:13 130:21 134:12 submitted 68:3 79:4 111:22 116:5,19 submitting 111:13 subscribed 141:18 subsequent 70:3 substance 118:16 substantively 120:10 succeed 108:21 succeeded 38:25 successful 34:14 succinct 19:19 sufficient 31:11 132:25 suggest 26:6 27:5 28:11 65:11 78:5 114:7 suggested 22:13 26:12 44:5 60:12 84:4 suggesting 28:10 43:13,14,16 137:5 suggestion 39:12 52:1 82:23 suggests 41:21 suit 74:13 105:21 suite 2:17 3:5 4:14 4:21 5:6,21 6:12,19 9:19 11:13 12:15 sullivan 42:3 summarize 86:8 summarizing 99:14 summary 38:6 41:1 sums 100:15 supplant 100:6 supplement 32:1 68:2,11,14 125:25 126:2 supplemental 78:24	support 16:16 60:2 126:24 suppose 119:24 supposed 28:4 121:9 supreme 42:17 43:6 51:7 sure 14:13 26:11 29:12 36:1,17 62:1 67:22 71:21,22 79:14 92:2,10 101:22 102:4 103:4 123:16 124:3 125:18 133:23 135:25 137:20 138:1,3 139:10,14 139:25 surplus 39:3 surreply 121:19 124:2,10 survived 73:25 suspect 135:10 sustainable 27:7 suzanne 1:23 2:19 141:22 sway 70:16 sworn 141:6 sylvie 6:4 16:17 sylviekern 6:8 sync 118:2 system 81:3
stated 65:4	straightforward 91:3 straus 5:12,17 15:21 strawn 11:3 15:17 streamline 24:10 street 3:14 4:6,21 5:6 6:5,12 7:8,17 8:14 10:5 11:13,22 12:6 13:6 55:5 126:16 strikes 97:20 strong 58:22 stronger 52:18 strongly 75:23 study 37:12 subject 46:20 submission 111:18 135:9,11	t t 5:5 10:20 table 24:3 28:7 100:14 tail 93:2 take 18:14 22:7 24:17 31:5 32:14 58:4,20 59:18 73:6 76:6 95:6 101:11 121:5 129:21 133:19 taken 37:15 51:8 52:14 141:3	

[takes - treble]

Page 27

takes	32:23	73:16,18 76:5,8	134:20 135:2 137:2	132:16 133:17
taladay	10:21 17:16	79:10 86:11 88:21	137:2,3,3,7,12	140:13,14,22 141:4
17:16		97:18 127:2 131:17	138:24 139:16,24	
talewsky	8:11 16:2	140:1,3,21	thinking	119:4
talk	19:21 39:11,17	thanks	52:23	times
44:9 54:4,5,7		93:19	57:13 66:21	34:18 39:10
118:21 133:19		the kresslawfirm.c...	thinks	52:9 70:22 83:12
talked	46:12,13 71:1	9:9	61:14	109:11 115:11,17
119:10 120:10		theoretical	19:5 42:4	tinkering
123:3 133:24		85:12	54:19 97:9 117:21	28:9 30:15
talking	45:2,2,23	theory	thirteenth	tmoore
46:9 66:6 102:24		44:17	11:22	8:17
109:5 118:16 135:6		theresa	thomson	today
talks	44:2 46:20	8:12,13 16:1	11:10 17:9	19:21 35:10
tank	97:14	thing	thoroughly	39:10,12,13 82:15
target	77:23	32:2 34:12	96:18	118:21 123:11
targeted	55:3 77:17	37:3 49:6 78:1	thought	128:15 136:11
targets	124:16	80:15 85:6 116:11	27:15 47:5	137:11 139:3,5
tatp.com	3:17,18	129:23	65:10 74:4 110:16	told
tee'd	23:25 93:21	things	112:18 119:19	32:19 52:12,13
tehama	7:8	23:23 24:11	121:1 123:11	89:15 90:18 98:18
telephone	6:11,18	33:20 35:6 54:3	135:11	127:20
9:5,11,18 10:21		57:22 76:3 82:6	thoughts	tomes
11:12,20,21 12:5		102:15,20 118:2,4	25:23	44:8
televisions	36:6,7	121:15	29:19	top
tell	73:6 81:19 83:24	think	59:7,10	19:12
88:25 99:5 103:21		18:13 21:5,6	three	toshiba
103:23 104:7		23:8 24:12 25:12,15	19:3 31:22	11:18 17:14
tells	82:12	25:20,25 26:6 29:10	39:21 54:15,21 55:2	total
ten	76:7 90:7	29:25 30:1,19 34:12	61:4 62:22 67:4	26:9 122:23
tend	99:25	40:7 42:3 46:17,18	70:2 109:11 117:8	totaling
tenet	44:16	50:15 52:23,25	137:4 138:2 140:5	85:6 122:11
tentatively	62:6	53:23 54:24 58:25	threshold	touched
term	98:6 113:4	60:7,7,13,17 61:18	126:21	110:25
terms	23:5 26:19	69:20 71:18,22 72:4	132:23	track
27:1 29:5 30:4 39:4		76:20 77:1,12 78:15	throw	108:21
59:22,22 83:18		79:16,16 81:14,22	28:11 59:21	tracy
86:16 87:3 94:20		82:18 84:25 85:6	59:22	7:6 15:1
testifying	141:6	86:19 88:18 90:24	thrown	traded
testimony	138:13	93:12 94:2 95:11	69:3 72:24	41:20
141:9		97:23 103:18	thursday	traditionally
texas	9:20	105:17,18 106:18	136:6	99:24
thank	16:13 17:12	107:6,10 109:17	137:20,22,25 140:9	100:21
23:17,19 24:2 26:3		111:1,9,20 114:4	140:11,18	transcribed
49:24 53:2,17 70:19		115:19,25 116:17	tigar	141:8
		118:13 119:13,18	21:11 23:5,24	transcript
		119:21 121:25	24:13,15 34:12	141:9,12
		122:10 123:6,15,19	60:20 107:3 117:1	141:14
		123:20 124:20	117:18	transferred
		126:11 128:7,9,22	time	75:19
		130:18 132:4,12	19:25 25:15,16	transparent
		133:10,14,16	25:17,18 33:15 52:9	119:12
			55:16 64:24 75:9,21	treated
			81:19 85:16,18,18	138:21
			91:4 96:21 98:21	treatise
			105:23 106:10	47:17
			111:20 116:9,15	treatment
			118:1 123:13 124:1	91:22
			126:20 127:12	98:20 105:9

[trebled - waive]

Page 28

trebled 109:8	type 52:2	unproven 60:6	varanini's 105:17
tremendous 132:12	types 106:14	61:16	113:16
132:14	typical 24:14	unreasonable 19:25	various 18:14 27:1,1
trial 8:3 34:14 35:23	u	unredacted 38:7	68:25 76:19 123:21
37:12 99:23	u.s. 97:10	unshackled 111:8	vegas 8:6
tried 46:3 64:24	ultimately 62:23	untrue 52:5	vehicles 48:16,18
65:25 102:1 119:11	68:24 103:10	updated 136:20	version 49:22,23
trk 7:12	117:14	uphill 58:19	versus 70:5,10
trotting 82:18	umm 45:11	upshot 81:8	110:23 113:24
trouble 126:2	un 60:5	urge 77:2	114:8
troubled 62:6,7	uncommon 124:20	urgent 119:25	vetted 74:5 80:2
troublesome 62:8	underlying 27:1,16	urias 4:12 14:22	vetting 73:24
troubling 96:16	28:25 30:10 54:1	use 65:6 77:9,11,15	viability 54:1 74:6
truck 97:14	undersigned 141:1	104:15	viable 56:16 57:10
true 52:5 65:13,16	understand 22:25	usefulness 134:11	59:14,23,24 60:2,11
73:3 138:8 141:9	53:10 69:9 76:17,18	uses 81:5	62:1 64:5
trump 3:11,11	82:7 97:6 123:7	usually 100:22	victims 67:11
try 19:18 32:4 33:5	127:5 128:18 132:4	v	view 30:13 32:12
59:22 72:20 90:10	139:14	v 131:21	72:25 75:12 85:5
109:14 119:8	understandable	vacation 119:16	99:20 106:3
124:11,17 135:4	133:5	vacuum 79:16	viewed 75:1
trying 22:19 46:9	understanding	valid 69:14	vindicating 44:15
76:3 88:7 92:9	102:1 122:12	valuable 48:1 71:6	violation 45:4,18
99:18 108:4,20	undoing 44:3	valuation 54:9	46:24 47:1
120:15 130:9	unearth 72:1	value 34:4,21 35:19	virginia 5:15
134:13	unequivocal 68:3	40:6 53:16 109:7,11	vis 28:2,2 29:5,5
tube 1:5 2:5 12:3	unfairly 104:20	110:7 116:15	30:10,10 105:20,20
17:11	unfairness 134:22	124:11,18 125:3,5	121:22,22
tubes 36:4,5,6	unforced 97:22,25	valued 32:8 33:21	visited 80:21
tuesday 1:17 2:19	unforeseen 107:8	33:22,24 34:2,9,25	vitally 34:21
14:1	unfortunate 107:7	70:23 71:7	voelbel 5:3
turn 110:1	uniform 66:8	valueless 40:20	voice 130:11
turns 134:14,17	union 3:14	values 35:20	volume 79:5
tv's 77:19	unique 104:14	valuing 34:22	volunteer 73:10
tweak 133:11	united 1:1 2:1 56:10	varanini 12:14 16:3	126:17
two 21:17 41:12	units 77:22	16:3 47:17 56:21	vote 101:6,8
42:6 67:9 68:24	university 5:14 8:10	98:15,17 99:2,4,9	w
70:22 71:3 80:14	16:2	99:12 101:8,13	w 10:12
85:3,4 89:17,21	unjust 45:16,25	102:4,8,14 105:3	wag 93:2 97:23
91:2 102:15 104:3	46:4,5,7 48:14	107:12,17,21	wait 35:14,14 37:14
107:21 112:17	unnamed 67:16	111:11 112:11,14	69:6,6,6 92:13
117:25 121:16	unprecedented	112:23 113:2 115:2	110:4
125:14 126:7	61:22	116:23 117:3,6,8	waive 39:6
131:13 133:19		119:19	
140:4			

[waived - à]

Page 29

waived 115:15	36:23 60:25 64:16	won 69:2	z
waiving 126:10	65:21 103:6 104:16	wonderful 47:5	zealously 52:16
wall 55:5	109:16 113:13	wondering 138:16	zelle 5:3 16:21
walnut 6:20	117:23 118:16	138:20	127:17,19,20
want 19:20,21,24	119:10 123:2	word 120:7	zelle.com 5:9,10
21:13,14,15,17 24:6	weak 58:22	words 20:1 120:21	zero 30:22 32:8 40:6
28:12 31:7 33:14	website 80:21 97:4	122:4 124:6,7	47:25 48:5 53:16
35:3,9 37:1 39:17	119:15	135:10	58:11,12,12
50:17,19 51:19 53:7	week 116:24 117:25	work 40:1 57:25	zucker 131:21
56:6,23 59:7,16,23	weighs 57:5	82:9 100:21	
61:12 62:18 63:25	welcome 28:15,16	working 57:24	à
64:8 66:10 73:6	28:24 30:1	85:15 105:12	à 28:2 29:5 30:10
85:21 93:2,17,18	went 33:2 35:23	112:16	105:20 121:22
98:16 107:6 118:5	64:23 73:24 74:1	works 63:9 85:1	
121:18 123:6,14	81:8 91:12 114:8	world 31:20 113:8	
124:1 125:18 126:6	135:12	worried 116:20,23	
132:10,19 133:16	westlaw 49:16,22	worse 66:12	
135:23 136:9 139:8	114:20	worth 48:5 76:2	
139:10,13,25	whack 85:10 102:13	100:13	
wanted 50:2 73:20	122:1	write 64:8	
113:11 114:17	whatsoever 70:16	writing 68:14	
118:21 123:2 138:9	whereof 141:18	wrong 80:7 105:11	
wanting 74:13	whistles 54:20	113:4	
wants 23:7 57:12	white 11:19 17:14	wrote 120:21	
61:15,15 97:1 123:9	whitecase.com		x
ward 4:12 14:22	11:25		x 94:7
wash 60:13	wide 39:11 55:6		
washington 10:23	wilhelmina 113:24		y
11:23 88:5,9,13	114:8	yahoo.com 6:8	
93:17 94:15 133:24	willing 27:22 41:10	yeah 23:1 53:9 59:4	
water 117:23 118:8	windfall 109:12,13	92:2,7 97:5	
waterfront 76:15	110:5	year 77:13	
way 18:12 22:4,17	winston 11:3 15:17	years 16:8 50:11,11	
23:12 28:14 29:20	winston.com 11:8	50:11 55:10 58:7	
32:2 41:25 42:8	wipes 86:6	61:5 64:10 74:2	
45:15,25 47:16	wiping 57:14	77:9,10,12,15	
52:24 64:13 68:19	wisdom 96:12	116:16,21 134:25	
81:9 93:4,17,18	wise 80:2	yell 14:12 24:6	
100:21 110:3,7	wish 77:3 78:5	yelling 14:11 15:10	
119:21 121:9 133:2	withdraw 20:23	yesterday 118:18	
ways 27:18,20,20	withdrawing 20:21	119:3	
28:6,21,21 29:12	witness 87:14 134:2	york 11:6,6	
36:13	141:18		
we've 21:20,24	witnesses 141:5		
22:13,16 34:18			

ATTACHMENT 2



a SourceHOV company

Accurately Reporting Notice Results to Courts

What We've Noticed

December 2015

by Shannon Wheatman, Ph.D. and Alicia Gehring

ABOUT WHAT WE'VE NOTICED

What We've Noticed is a periodic publication from Rust Consulting and Kinsella Media highlighting current trends and best practices.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS



Shannon Wheatman, Ph.D., is the president of Kinsella Media. Dr. Wheatman uses her analytical expertise in designing, developing, analyzing, and implementing large-scale legal notification plans. She has implemented numerous programs using creative techniques that have successfully stimulated claims.

D: 202.379.1150

E: swheatman@kinsellamedia.com



Alicia Gehring manages a team of media planners while staying on top of the ever-evolving trends in media. She has worked in the advertising industry for more than 20 years, overseeing high-profile national campaigns as well as working with regional clients. Before coming to Kinsella Media, Alicia held positions at recognized ad agencies in New York, Louisville, and Washington D.C.

D: 202.686.4111

E: agehring@kinsellamedia.com

ABOUT RUST CONSULTING AND KINSELLA MEDIA

The nation's leading class action administration and notification firms, Rust Consulting and Kinsella Media also provide companies an array of non-settlement solutions. With skills and expertise in project and data management, plain language, notice program design and implementation, contact centers, claims processing, and fund distribution, we manage unexpected crisis communications or administrative needs so you can focus on your core business functions. Our non-settlement services include data breach responses, plain language services, product recalls, and remediation programs.



@RustConsulting
@KinsellaMedia



[linkedin.com/company/
rust-consulting](http://linkedin.com/company/rust-consulting)
[linkedin.com/company/
kinsella-media-llc](http://linkedin.com/company/kinsella-media-llc)

Accurately Reporting Notice Results to Courts

What We've Noticed

December 2015

by Shannon Wheatman, Ph.D. and Alicia Gehring

While the industry publicly debates questions of notice—direct versus media notice; the appropriate mix of print, broadcast, and online delivery; acceptable minimum notice reach—a more troublesome trend simmers beneath the surface: increasingly, false information is being reported to courts. Presumably unintentionally, unqualified notice providers are making serious errors in their affidavits and declarations. Here are two recent examples:

Food Case

70%+ reach reported to the court.

KM estimated the actual measured reach was 16%.

Incorrectly combined online and print media reach by using two different target audiences that could not be combined. Also assumed every impression delivered online would reach a class member.

Pharmaceutical Case

80%+ reach reported to the court.

KM analyzed the notice program and determined the actual measured reach was 67%.

Errors were found in the calculation of online media as well as the estimated reach from direct mail.

The Federal Judicial Center's Notice Checklist recommends that judges critically review a proposed notice program and ask: "Do you have unbiased evidence supporting the plan's adequacy?"¹ The FJC Checklist also warns judges to "[b]e careful if the notice plan was developed by a vendor who submitted a low bid and might have incentives to cut corners [in order to win the administration] or cover up any gaps in the notice program."

As noted above, the most obvious issue resulting in inaccuracies is incorrect measurement of the online notice's effectiveness. An experienced media professional relies on trusted third-party tools to correctly measure and report total reach against a correctly defined target audience, including tools to measure online delivery. Online now provides unprecedented targeting capabilities, but reporting that delivery must represent the entirety of the class that can be measured across all media: digital, print, and broadcast.

Further compounding the problem are digital challenges including ad fraud, relevancy, and transparency. Today's digital capabilities make it crucial to rely on correctly reported online reach and to be diligent in watching for incorrectly reported figures. A challenge such as ad fraud (ads being served to 'bots,' or non-human traffic) requires experienced digital professionals to closely monitor online activity. Media professionals must also closely monitor campaigns to ensure ads are delivered in relevant, trusted editorial environments and deliver what was promised.

Asking pertinent questions will help practitioners vet notice providers (or preferably, notice experts) and ensure the resulting programs are reported accurately and found acceptable to courts.

¹ Federal Judicial Center, Judges' Class Action Notice and Claims Process Checklist and Plain Language Guide, available at [http://www.fjc.gov/public/pdf.nsf/lookup/NotCheck.pdf/\\$file/NotCheck.pdf](http://www.fjc.gov/public/pdf.nsf/lookup/NotCheck.pdf/$file/NotCheck.pdf), at 2.

WHO IS A NOTICE EXPERT?

All of this begs the question, who should be trusted as a notice expert? Many claims administrators have become “notice experts” overnight, providing courts with case citations their firm administered … without clarifying that they did not opine to these notice programs. At a minimum, a notice expert should possess all of the following traits:

- Recognition by courts of expert status through court testimony.
- Training and/or in-depth experience in media planning and paid media measurement.
- Thorough knowledge of Rule 23 and particularly of 23(c)(2)(B) requirements for notice.
- Ability to translate complicated legal issues into accurate plain language that facilitates class member understanding of the litigation and their legal rights.
- Creation of effective print, Internet, radio, and TV notices consistent with best advertising practices.
- Understanding of direct notice deliverability issues that affect notice sufficiency, whether in email, postcard, or other mailed notice formats.
- Ability to combine direct notice reach, when known, with media reach to ascertain overall unduplicated reach of class members.

VETTING NOTICE PROVIDERS: SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

- **Is the notice provider’s CV limited to cases on which they worked on a notice program as an expert?**
Or does it include cases administered, without rendering an opinion?
- **Who calculated the reach of the notice program?**
If an outside vendor, find another expert because you are not relying on an outside vendor for an opinion.
- **What target audience is being used for measurement?**
Is it different for print and online? If so, ask the notice provider how he/she can combine apples and oranges?
- **What tools or software are being used to evaluate reach and frequency?**
Are they industry standard (GfK MRI, comScore)?
- **Does the plan provide a mix of media?**
Some notice providers are pushing online-only plans (without any direct notice) despite the fact that 100% of class members are not online when ads are being delivered. Almost 17% of Adults 18+ have not used the Internet in the last 30 days and that number increases to 30% for Adults 50+ and 45% for Adults 65+.²
- **Does the plan include reach from a press release, search ads, or other online media where reach cannot be measured?**
Don’t include reach from media that cannot be measured at the beginning of the notice program. If you include it as a measured reach at the end, your expert needs to detail how reach was calculated.
- **Does the plan factor out duplication?**
E.g., 50% reach online + 30% reach direct mail does not equal 80%. (It equals 65% because of duplication.)
- **How was the reach of Internet components calculated?**
Notice providers must rely on trusted measurement tools such as Comscore, the leading Internet analytics company and the standard tool for measuring online media reach. A plan should reference which online measurement software was used in reach calculations to ensure best practices are used.

² GFK MRI 2015 Doublebase.